

NEW SERIES

XV, No. 1

CLERGY REVIEW

JULY, 1938

CONTENTS INCLUDE

DEVOTION TO PARTS OF THE SACRED
HUMANITY OF CHRIST

BY REV. B. LEEMING, S.J.

TRUE AND FALSE REALISM IN ART

BY REV. E. LEEN, C.S.Sp.

THE PRINCIPLES AND METHOD
OF THE J.O.C.

BY REV. COLUMBA CARY-ELWES, O.S.B.

HOMILETICS

BY REV. B. MILLER

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

I—DOGMATIC THEOLOGY II—HISTORY

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

REVIEWS, &c.

LONDON

BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE LTD.

PUBLISHERS TO THE HOLY SEE

43-45 NEWGATE STREET, E.C.1

Price Two Shillings Net

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

Fifty Contributors
to
THE TABLET
in 1937

Donald Attwater
Hilaire Belloc
J. L. Benvenisti
W. J. Blyton
Tancred Borenius
James Brodrick, S.J.
Dom Christopher Butler
Abbot Cabrol, O.S.B.
Algernon Cecil
Rupert Croft-Cooke
Anthony Crossley, M.P.
M. C. D'Arcy, S.J.
Reginald Dingle
H. O. Evennett
Archbishop Goodier, S.J.
Graham Greene
T. S. Gregory
Waldemar Gurian
Cecily Hallack
M. V. Hay
Christopher Hollis
Philip Hughes
Gyles Isham
Reginald Jebb
J. M. N. Jeffries

Douglas Jerrold
H. J. T. Johnson
Ronald Knox
Shane Leslie
P. C. Loftus, M.P.
Arnold Lunn
Vincent McNabb, O.P.
C. C. Martindale, S.J.
David Mathew
J. Lewis May
E. C. Messenger, Ph.D.
J. B. Morton
Alfred Noyes
Sean O'Faolain
Richard O'Sullivan
E. Allison Peers
Gil Robles
R. H. J. Steuart, S.J.
G. Temple
W. R. Thompson, F.R.S.
Herbert Thurston, S.J.
Michael Trappes-Lomax
F. M. R. Walshe
E. I. Watkin
Douglas Woodruff

Send a postcard for free specimen copy to-day

The Tablet, 39 Paternoster Row, E.C.4



to
c
is
F
h
in

t
I

M

S

THE CLERGY REVIEW

Chairman of the Editorial Board :
Most Reverend Archbishop Downey

Editor :
Very Reverend T. E. Flynn, V.F.

Submission of articles of direct practical interest to the pastoral clergy is invited. Submission of cases in Moral Theology, Canon Law, and Liturgy is invited, also *dubia* in Dogmatic Theology and Holy Scripture. Correspondence on solutions that have appeared, and on any matters of pastoral interest, is invited.

Matter offered for publication may be sent direct, to save time, to the Editor at St. Mary's, Chorley, Lancs.

Other correspondence should be sent to the Manager,

THE CLERGY REVIEW
BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE LTD.
43-45 NEWGATE STREET, LONDON, E.C.1

Subscription Rates for twelve monthly numbers :

£1 OR FIVE DOLLARS POST FREE
SINGLE NUMBERS TWO SHILLINGS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

JULY 1938

ARTICLES :

	PAGE
(1) Devotion to Parts of the Sacred Humanity of Christ	1
By REV. B. LEEMING, S.J.	
(2) True and False Realism in Art	12
By REV. E. LEEN, C.S.Sp., D.D., M.A.	
(3) The Principles and Method of the J.O.C.	26
By REV. COLUMBA CARY-ELWES, O.S.B.	
(4) Calvin, Usury and the Reformation	36
By REV. A. BECK, A.A., B.A.	

HOMILETICS :

The Sundays of August	49
By REV. B. MILLER, D.D., Ph.D.	

NOTES ON RECENT WORK :

(1) Dogmatic Theology	59
By VERY REV. CANON G. D. SMITH, D.D., Ph.D.	
(2) History	65
By REV. A. BECK, A.A., B.A.	

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS :

(1) Delectatio Venera	72
(2) Cooperatio Uxor in Onanismo	73
(3) The Eucharistic Fast	75
(4) Leonine Prayers	76
(5) Dispensation Ceasing	77
(6) Panegyrics	79
By VERY REV. CANON E. J. MAHONEY, D.D.	

ROMAN DOCUMENTS	80
CHURCH MANAGEMENT	81
BOOK REVIEWS	86
CORRESPONDENCE.	94

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES.

VOL. XV, No. 1.

JULY, 1938

DEVOTION TO PARTS OF THE SACRED HUMANITY OF CHRIST

SINCE Christ is God, He is in every respect adorable. St. Thomas, looking upon the wounds in the human flesh of Christ, rightly said: "My Lord and my God". For our Lord's humanity exists only in union with the divinity and has no separate existence apart from the divinity; the same is true of every part of His sacred humanity. His hands are the hands of God, His eyes the eyes of God, His body and His blood are the body and the blood of God Himself, and as such are adorable.

It may, however, be asked if it follows from this that special devotion may be paid to any part of our Saviour's humanity. In fact, the Church cultivates special devotion to the Precious Blood, and to the Sacred Heart; but upon other devotions, which at first sight might look similar, the Church has frowned. In 1901 a formal request was made to the Holy Office for approval of devotion to the most holy Soul of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of prayers in connection with that devotion. The request was refused; and under the title "Decrees condemning devotion to the most holy Soul of our Lord Jesus Christ (*Decreta condemnatoria devotionis erga Animam SS. D.N.I.C.*) the Holy Office renewed three previous condemnations:

(1) In March 1875 the Sacred Congregation of Rites sent a dossier to the Holy Office in connection with devotion to the most holy Soul of Christ, and the latter decreed: "Care is to be taken lest, under pretext of devotion to the most holy Soul of Christ, deplorable novelties in images, pictures, formularies of prayer or in other sacred things, should creep into

the public worship of the Church ; and without advice from the Holy See no novelty whatever is to be introduced, especially if it be derived from revelations or visions which have been neither examined nor approved. Moreover, in the writings sent to the Sacred Congregation of Rites several things have been found which can in no wise be approved, and such writings may not be published without previous correction."

(2) In 1893 a request was made for the foundation of an Institute for the adoration of the most holy Soul of our Lord. The request was refused ; and the Bishop was instructed to withdraw certain indulgences he had attached to prayers to the most holy Soul of Christ, and not to place credence in various revelations relating thereto.

(3) In the same year an examination was made of certain prayers to the most holy Soul of Christ, and the Bishop was instructed to see that they were corrected.¹

These decrees, of course, relate to devotion to the most holy Soul of Christ, not in general, but in the particular form in which it was then proposed and advocated ; the devotion condemned was connected with certain particular writings, prayers, pictures, revelations and visions, and the condemnation can scarcely be alleged as unequivocal evidence that the Church frowns upon all and every devotion to the Soul of Christ. Nevertheless, the title of the decree of 1901 is unqualified : *Decreta condemnatoria devotionis erga Animam SS. D.N.I.C.* ; nor was any clause introduced explaining that devotion to the most holy Soul might be permissible in itself, but not in this particular connection ; the reason given was that of novelty, apart from errors in the writings and prayers ; and finally, after that date, agitation in favour of the devotion would appear to have died away.

Similarly, a devotion to the "powerful hand of

¹ *Acta Sanctae Sedis*, vol. xxxiii, pp. 758-59, 1 May, 1901.

Christ" was condemned in 1896, a book advocating it being placed on the Index¹; and in 1892 the Holy Office disapproved "a special and distinct cult of the Face of our divine Redeemer, although veneration of pictures of the Face of our divine Redeemer is to be encouraged in so far as it increases among the faithful memory of Christ's passion, contrition for sin and desire of reparation".²

Now in granting or withholding approval to such devotions it is obvious that the Church may be guided, not only by the abstract theological correctness of the devotion in question, but also by its opportuneness; a devotion unexceptional in itself might be misunderstood because the minds of the faithful in certain countries were not prepared for it, or because of some extrinsic association. Thus those who work among the dissident Orthodox exercise considerable caution in propagating certain devotions understood and accepted by the Latins, which, however, find the Orthodox mind somewhat unprepared. Thus, too, for some little time there was a certain coolness towards devotion to the Eucharistic Heart of our Lord, because of its association with a picture of a host on which was drawn or painted an emblem of the Sacred Heart, and also, perhaps, because some showed an inclination to imagine that this devotion was different from ordinary devotion to the Eucharist and to the Sacred Heart. On 3 April, 1915, the Holy Office answered the Archbishop of Paris:

"It is not surprising that ever since the devotion to the Eucharistic Heart began to spread, the Holy See should have always declared that devotion to the Sacred Heart in the Eucharist was not more perfect than the worship of the Eucharist, nor different from that of the Sacred Heart; on the contrary, this

¹ Cf. de Guibert, *Documenta Christianae Perfectionis, Romae*, 1935, pp. 477.

² Cf. de Guibert, *op. cit.*, p. 474.

devotion has more than once been explicitly recognized, but in the sense indicated, not otherwise. With regard to the new emblems, images, titles and liturgical feasts relating to this devotion, they have been forbidden, above all lest the people, enamoured of novelty, should give to the devotion itself an erroneous or very inopportune meaning, at the risk of exposing a matter so holy to malicious criticism."¹

The classical case of a devotion being unreasonably misunderstood and unintelligently, or even maliciously, attacked, is devotion to the Sacred Heart; and the answers made by its defenders seem to suggest principles of application in the question of devotion to parts of the Sacred Humanity in general. The Jansenists objected that the devotion was new, and accused the faithful of adoring the Heart as though it were separated from the whole humanity, or from the Divine Person.² The charge of novelty was denied, and upon it there is no need to dwell, as the answer admittedly showed the devotion had existed, at least in germ, from very early times, and explicitly from the twelfth century.³ To the second charge the Polish bishops referred in their Memorial presented in 1765 to the Congregation of Rites, asking for a Mass and Office of the Sacred Heart; they said:

"To exclude all possibility of doubt, it must always be remembered and sedulously kept in mind that in this devotion the Heart of Jesus is to be regarded, not as though It were something inanimate or without feeling, but as living and sentient and most intimately united with the soul of Jesus and with the divine Person. The Heart of Jesus is not to be considered as it were in isolation, or as a separate and

¹ Cf. Jean Bainvel, *Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus* (English translation), London, 1924, p. 318, where the history of the matter is given fully.

² Cf. Prop. 63 Synod. Pistor, Denziger, n. 1563.

³ Cf. Bainvel, *op. cit.*, p. 126, where a long bibliography is given: monographs or books relative to the devotion in different countries and orders are numerous.

distinct thing by itself, but as forming, together with the soul and Person, one single object of devotion. This unity as an object of devotion is formed of the Heart of Jesus and His human soul and His divine Person : and together with this, all the graces, treasures of heavenly gifts and wisdom, and all the virtues of this most Sacred Heart, including too the wound received upon the Cross, whence flowed after death the last drop of His blood for our sake."¹

The same thing was put more fully by P. Galliffet, Postulator of the Cause of the Feast, in answering objections made by the Promotor of the Faith :

"In a word, on this point some people's minds are confused. They look upon the Heart of Jesus, the special object of the devotion, in a wholly materialistic way, as they would upon a relic of a Saint's body, religiously preserved in a reliquary. This is a gross error. Such is not at all the manner in which the Feast of the Sacred Heart must be understood. How, then, is it to be understood? We shall explain briefly ; we must look upon the Heart of Jesus :

"(1) As being one (because of the close union) with the soul and Person of the Word Incarnate. (Rem unam quodammodo constituit.)

"(2) As being the symbol or natural seat of all the virtues and of all the interior sentiments of Christ, and in particular of His immense love for His Father and for men.

"(3) As the centre or focus of all the interior anguish that our most loving Redeemer suffered for love of us during His whole life, and especially during His Passion.

"(4) Not losing sight of the wound that this Heart of Jesus received on the cross, a wound significant not so much of the physical piercing by the soldier's lance, as of the greatness of the love of Christ.

¹ N. Nilles, *De Rationibus festorum SS. Cordis Iesu et Purissimi Cordis Marie*, Oeniponte, 1873, pp. 94-5.

"All these things are the special characteristics of the Heart of Jesus, and all, united with the Heart itself, form the object of this feast ; and hence it follows—and here is a point well worthy of consideration—that thus conceived this object embraces really and truly the whole of the interior life of our Lord Jesus Christ. How sublime that is, and how replete with the sublimest mysteries, needs no explanation.

"This, then," continues P. Galliffet, "is the true, genuine and proper idea and nature of the devotion to the Heart of Jesus. Too much attention cannot be called to it, and upon it too much insistence cannot be laid : the object of the feast of the Sacred Heart in no wise consists of the Heart alone, taken by itself, solitary, as it were, material and corporal. It consists of that wonderful and truly divine complex of things formed by the physical wounded Heart of Jesus, by the most holy soul, whence that Heart lives, by the Person of the divine Word, hypostatically united to that Heart, whence the Heart is divine ; then, the immense love with which that Heart burns, the virtues of which the heart is the seat or symbol, the sorrows and griefs suffered by that Heart for the sake of men. This whole complex of things, so sublime, so admirable, so lovable, so divine, is the proper and adequate object of the Feast of the Sacred Heart."¹

This wide scope of the devotion, or as one might say, its universality, is agreed upon by practically all authors. Fr. Lempl puts it : "The Heart of Jesus which we worship and adore includes all the interior and psychic faculties of our Lord which in any way contribute to moral action, that is, the soul with its spiritual faculties of intellect and will, the power of the imagination, the sensitive inclinations and their physical organism, as well as the real heart, which,

¹ Nilles, *op. cit.*, pp. 127-28.

because of a very natural association, forms the basis for this wider concept"¹; Franzelin says: "that divine Heart is a symbol of the love and of the whole interior life of Jesus"²; Muncunill: "the physical heart is a symbol of charity, or, in other words, it is a real thing which signifies the charity of Christ, and all His other interior affections"³; Billot: "our adoration is directed not to the heart as separate from the divine hypostasis, but to the very Person of the Word Incarnate, considered in His Heart and in all that is symbolized in the Heart, whether pertaining to the humanity or to the divinity", and again: "in the Sacred Heart is summed up the whole essence and manner of that loving ecstasy by which the Supreme Nature condescended to us"⁴; Hugon: "the heart is understood as meaning the divine Person, in as much as It manifests Itself in the affective life, of which the heart is a symbol"⁵; Otten: "the physical heart is indeed adored, but the living, feeling, moving heart, hypostatically united to the Person of the Word, and connoting the whole theandric composite, of which it is an integral part"⁶; Galtier: "the object of the devotion is both the physical heart as a symbol of love and the love itself of Christ, or rather, all the affections of which the heart is usually the symbol."⁷

And Vermeersch: "Is not all religion summed up in the words God and our Redeemer?—that is, the essence of religion lies in the knowledge of God and of our Redeemer and in the love which naturally follows from that knowledge. But is not Christ our God and our Redeemer? And is not devotion to the Sacred Heart devotion to the whole Christ (*cultus totius*

¹ *Das Herz Jesu, eine Studie über die verschiedenen Bedeutungen des Wortes "Herz" und über den Gegenstand der kirchlicher Herz-Jesu-Andacht*, Brixen, 1909, p. 222.

² *De Verbo Incarnato*, p. 473.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 604.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 193.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 369.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 650.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 248.

Christi), as, pitying our lot, He revealed Himself as compassionate and loving?"¹

From such statements, which could be multiplied indefinitely, it is clear that theologians are anxious to exclude from the devotion any idea of division, partition or limitation, and to stress the wider, more general and more universal aspect of the devotion; they identify it with devotion to the whole Christ, in all that He is and has done, the heart being the concrete means, like His whole humanity, by which He is revealed to us. With this theological doctrine, or explanation, the practice of the Church agrees; for though the Church permits certain emblems of the heart alone, on certain scapulars, or to be carried privately, still, in pictures for public veneration, the heart may not be depicted as separate from its natural position, and our Lord must be represented as showing His Heart—that is, at least the head and breast must appear, and not the heart alone.²

It would seem, then, to follow that devotions to our Lord are to be encouraged in so far as they make Him known and loved in the whole of His Person and of His work. Private devotions, indeed, may vary according to the perceptions of the individual, and may be directed to, or moved by, consideration of one or other part of the Sacred Humanity; there seems no reason why one should not, in private, have a special devotion to the sacred shoulder which bore the cross, or to the sacred hands which worked miracles, or to the sacred eyes which wept over Jerusalem. But public devotions to Christ are in another class. Being public they should be independent of any merely individual perception, idiosyncrasy or taste, so that they may be universal in their revelation of Christ, that is, in making Christ known, and

¹ *Adnotationes in Litt. Encyc. Miserentissimus Redemptor, Periodica de Re Morali, Canonica, Liturgica*, t. 17, 1928, p. 121.

² Cf. Bainvel, *op. cit.*, p. 316, where the relative decisions are enumerated.

in consequence in their appeal to rouse our love of Him.

The Church, indeed, has not told us the reasons why she allows special devotion to the Sacred Heart and Precious Blood, and forbids it in regard to other parts of the Sacred Humanity. But one may conjecture that the basic principle is that things are to be treated as they are ; pictures and statues are honoured according to their representative character ; a priest, according to his priestly character ; the Holy Father, according as he represents Christ upon earth. Our Lady is revered because she is the Mother of God ; and our Saviour is adored because He is very God. The parts of our Lord's humanity are adored precisely as they are parts of the God-made-man, and in consequence, in accord with their partial character, that is, in accord with their relation to the whole, to the Person and work of our Saviour. Now, obviously, there are certain parts or organs of humanity whose connection with personality are less obvious, as the bones or the lungs ; special attention to them would tend to emphasize the material or animal parts of the nature, and special devotions to them would not readily call to mind the whole Person, or what is noblest in a human being. Any devotion to a part of the Sacred Humanity, just in so far as it is made special, tends to emphasize the part ; to the extent that the devotion is specially to this or that part, the connection with the whole is diminished. For instance, a special devotion to the Soul of our Lord, in so far as it were made special, might tend to lessen attention to the Sacred Body, to bring forgetfulness of the whole Manhood, which consists of body and soul united to make one man, and so might tend to divide Christ, and to lessen attention to the condescension of God, Who united Himself personally with human nature in its entirety, sin excepted.

Here may be permitted an applied use of the text :

"Is Christ divided?" Christ is both God and man, and as His humanity cannot be separated from His divinity, so neither can the parts of the humanity be divided one from another, much less from the whole. For Christ is one. Multiplication of devotions to different parts of the Sacred Humanity might open the way to misunderstandings; we might be faced with the unhappy spectacle of the faithful having a choice of attending different Sunday evening services to different parts of the Sacred Humanity of Christ: at one church, special devotions to the Sacred Face, at another special devotions to the Sacred Soul, at a third special devotions to the Sacred Hand. There might even be the unedifying possibility of devotees, with indiscreet and mistaken zeal, declaring or implying that special devotion to one part was preferable to special devotion to another part, or suggesting that devotion to one part might involve neglect of another part; whereas, in fact, all devotions must be directed to the Person, and therefore, ultimately, to the whole Christ.

Further, multiplication of such devotions might easily lead to discussions of the physiological relations between parts of the Sacred Humanity; and it would seem irreverent, for instance, to raise general discussion of the relation of our Saviour's brain to His soul and interior life. Discussions of a similar nature about the physiological relation of the heart to the affective life at one time began to take place in connection with devotion to the Sacred Heart, and were definitely forbidden by Pius IX.¹ Nor does there appear to be any pressing need for multiplication of such devotions; for it cannot reasonably be suggested that the present approved devotions to the Sacred Humanity are in need of completion, or possibly of correction in emphasis or weight. Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, "in whom", to quote our

¹ Cf. Bainvel, *op. cit.*, pp. 108-9.

Holy Father, Pius XI, in his Encyclical, *Miserentissimus Redemptor*, "are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge", has not only the fullest approval of the Church, but has repeatedly been declared by the Popes as most fully adapted to the needs of our times.¹

BERNARD LEEMING, S.J.

¹ *Litt. Encycl. Miserentissimus Redemptor*, 8 May, 1928.

PUBLISHERS' ANNOUNCEMENT.

The Publishers will be pleased to bind in a single volume, in good quality cloth, subscribers' copies of Volume XIV (January-June, 1938), together with Index, at a cost of 3s. 6d. (or 4s. including return postage). Those who wish to take advantage of this offer should send their copies and Index, as soon as possible, to THE CLERGY REVIEW, Messrs. Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd., 43-45 Newgate Street, London, E.C.1.

TRUE AND FALSE REALISM IN ART

ACCORDING to the ordinary usage of language the term artist is applied only to the person whose powers of mind and imagination, aided by manual dexterity, are devoted to the production of works of beauty. Artist commonly means one who consecrates his activities to the fine arts. An understanding of what fine art is demands an accurate analysis of the notion of the beautiful. "*Pulchrum est quod visum placet.*" The beautiful is that which when contemplated causes delight. It has been disputed whether this vision refers to the eye of the body or of the mind, that is, whether the contemplation of which there is question, is of sense or of spirit. The truth of the matter is that it is neither the one nor the other exclusively. It is a vision in which mind and body are engaged. In the perception of the beautiful, sense vision acts as an instrument of intellectual vision. The intuition of the mind reaches an intelligible form presented through, and resplendent in, sensible conditions.

Since the function of the artist is to impress on matter a form generated in his mind and since it is the fruit of his activity as creative, that when contemplated gives pleasure, this pleasure must spring from a contemplation which is strongly impregnated with intelligibility. What the artist endeavours to convey is that which has flashed on his own inward vision and which he has perforce to communicate in some plastic material, in colour, or in stone or in rhythmic movements. Hence it is that in spite of the perfect mastery over the material that really great artists possess, they feel a certain exasperation against the limitations of expression imposed by their materials. The most perfect docility of matter to their touch leaves them dissatisfied and almost despairing. Hence too arises

the temptation to the fatal attempt to extenuate matter to the utmost in the production of a work of art. It is a temptation which lies at the root of those aberrations of genius that mystify and exasperate those who frequent modern art galleries.

The thinker to form his concept of a thing has to dematerialize that in which his thought is embodied. The artist has to do something analogous with the actual material things which serve his art. His work is far harder than that of the thinker. He has to spiritualize his materials without taking from their materiality. His paints remain paints, his marble marble. And these resisting material things must be so worked on by him that they flash his own mental vision on the perception of the beholder. What concepts and words readily do for the transference of thought, that plastic materials have to do for the transference of artistic vision. Hence the mysterious and utterly elusive ("*insaisissable*") commingling of sense vision and intellectual vision in the perception of the beautiful.

The emotional satisfaction given by fine art ought to be in perfect accord with the intellectual delight that it is its main object to impart. It is only when this harmony is realized that a work of art, in any sphere of artistic production, effects what Aristotle terms the purification of the passions. In a man's own personal experience, the passions are stirred by events pleasant or painful. Under the stress of emotions and feelings excited by causes which intimately affect man's vital interests, the balance of reason and its smooth functioning are threatened with disturbance. The energetic play of the passions in these circumstances brings disorder into life. Yet the richness and fullness of human life, as such, demands the strong and vital play of a man's emotional nature. Neither insensibility nor insensitiveness nor impassivity is to be regarded as a virtue. So Aristotle teaches and S.

Thomas after him. To be passionless is not to be perfect. To have one's passions perfectly under the control of, and harnessed to reason, that is perfection.

This sublimation or rationalization of passion is produced in a transient manner by all great art. Not only the dramatic masterpiece, but every form of beauty begotten of a genius truly artistic, calls up emotions of admiration, delight, fear, pity, terror and the like, but calls them forth in the order of harmony and truth. Thus are purified the passions by developing them and exciting their activity according to the order of beauty and in the measure prescribed by reason. To see the force of all this clearly one has only to contrast the condition of soul caused by the emotion of fear, when the fear is of an actual menacing evil and the condition when the emotion arises from evil represented dramatically on the stage. Even children who are temperamentally timorous find an intense delight in having artificial terror called up for them. On the other hand a man who would allow himself so to be carried away by dramatic wickedness as to enter into wrath with the villain on the stage would show himself devoid of all artistic perception. And the emotions stirred by art are not wholly artificial. For where the artist is true to life and nature, the spectator is given the power of identifying himself with the various moods and fortunes of the imaginary characters. In them one, for the moment, lives outside of oneself and yet remains aware that the emotional consequences following on this "ecstasis" will have no disturbing effect on one's normal existence. The same pleasurable melting into the moods of nature is made possible when the spirit of nature is revealed through the artist's brush. The same principle finds verification in sculpture and, indeed, in every branch of art. The calm delight, for instance, given by the contemplation of the symmetry and grace of form of the sculptured athlete is wholly free from

the disturbing elements that would intrude themselves into the contemplation of a real living athlete in action. The delight administered by the intuition of the sculptured figure is faultless and serene. But the artist who by his work is thus to purify the passions, must achieve what finds a response in human nature as such and not merely what answers to his own personal mood or temperament or to the fashion of a coterie.

The work of the artist to have a legitimate appeal must be universal. Universality as opposed to particularity is the essential note of all that has its origin in the intellect. And it is only by what is of the intellect that man can enter into communication with man. What is the product of mere sense, mere imagination or mere emotion, is incommunicably confined to the being experiencing that sensation, or that imagination or that emotion. What a man senses is only sensed by himself: what he sees intellectually can be seen by another. Hence it is that poets, orators and artists who aim at creating a splendid form of the true, that is the beautiful, operate with confident assurance that they will find a responsive echo and a sympathy, in the literal sense of the word, in the aesthetic faculties of those to whom their works are addressed. It is only what is true that can be fully transmitted from men to men and from generation to generation.

What appeals exclusively to sense and imagination always fails to move another age and another race. A contemporary school of drama, in spite of some real merits, does not succeed in producing works of real art, through inability to conform to this law of universality. Mistaking the sense of the precept that art must imitate nature, they deem it the work of the dramatist to transfer to the stage life in an exact and literal manner. Their drama is nothing more than a skilful photography of

living scenes. With extreme fidelity they retrace in their characters the obvious, individualizing traits of human beings. They transcribe accurately the manner of acting, the tricks of speech, the external characteristics, and the current values of the world which they aim at dramatizing. But they fail to portray human beings who are human beings in the full sense of the word. They reveal the singular but not the universal. They present to the audience certain outward aspects of men, but they do not present humanity. They do not succeed in creating that link between player and onlooker, in virtue of which the onlooker could easily imagine himself in the very actions and reactions of the dramatic situation.

The characters on the stage are not men with that universality of appeal which springs from an intelligent seizure of what human nature itself is and of its broad underlying potentialities for good and evil. The characterization is merely of what strikes sense and imagination and is not charged with any deeper significance. This is because it is the product of minds incapable of grasping the real, permanent, underlying and essential qualities of life and being. It is possible to admire the keenness of observation displayed, the accurate seizure of peculiarities, the humour or the irony of the dialogue, but the effect of the whole is to leave the soul impoverished and unenlightened. This accurate and close rendering of the facts or the phenomena of life may be excellent journalism but it is not dramatic art. The feelings stirred by these slavish transcripts of actual existence are not the feelings of tenderness, pity, exultation or salutary fear that arise from a fundamental sympathy between the spectator and the personages portrayed on the stage. The mere literal transference of a scene of everyday life from its regular setting on to the stage does not constitute a dramatic situation. It is only when the stage action is made the sensible showing

forth of the conflict of those fundamental forces in life which lie at the origin of tragic failure, heroic endurance or profound pathos, that it becomes true drama.

For life to be dramatized it must be in a certain sense "idealized"—that is to say, seized in those elements of it which go to the construction of a reality of a splendid and elevated kind. A representation of even the commonplace must suggest the great possibilities for good and evil in human nature. The nature of a thing can be fully discerned, says Aristotle, only when the thing is seen at the stage of its fullest development, for nature implies complete development. The more any created object approximates to the idea after which it has been created, or, in other words, the more that its possibilities are fulfilled, the more real does it become. Hence the ideal and the real are intimately connected. Any showing of human incidents that does not give an insight into, or at least a transient vision of the ideal form of human character, cannot lay claim to being true to reality.

The characterization of the obvious, the superficial, the individual, or the merely singular is but a spurious realism. The realism that is so much sought after at the present day and is so vaunted is not true realism, it is what I should term 'actualism'. It is only when a man sheds the conventional, the merely actual or transient, when he sheds what in him is but the pure accident of a particular training, culture or social condition, that he shows himself in the depths of his being as the theatre for those great contending forces that make or mar human destinies. These are the elemental forces that issue in events on a large scale. In drama as in every other form of art, the reality to be set forth must be a reality that is invested with a certain form of greatness or splendour. The ordinary must, under the artist's touch, undergo a certain transfiguration, be lifted up above the com-

monplace, and be endowed with an aptitude to suggest the extraordinary. The strictly local and temporal must be universalized, it must be interpenetrated with a quality which lifts it above place and time and makes it true for all places and at all times.

It is in this universality of his characters that Shakespeare stands pre-eminent amongst dramatists. We can follow, enter into, and sympathize with the destinies of each of his characters, virtuous or wicked, because we are aware that we ourselves could be any one of them, were we submitted to the same temptations, beset with the same difficulties and swayed to a like degree by the same storms of passion. We realize keenly that there are in ourselves the same elements out of which his heroes are formed, and the elements too of which are begotten the vices of his villains. Those who move through his dramas are not mere clay models but living beings. They are persons that we ourselves might be. Hence it is that commentators on Shakespeare's plays inadvertently drift into the way of analysing the actions and motives and characters, the success and failure of his personages, exactly as if they were real, historical personages who had lived and loved and sinned on the stage of the world.

It is a profound error to judge that artistic achievement consists in giving nature a new setting. Nature is not art ready made. Nature is not art, nor is art nature as the very sense of the terms indicates. What is natural is opposed to what is Art-ificial. This word artificial is not to be understood according to the pejorative sense it has acquired. It is to be taken literally as equivalent to that which results from the exercise of art. It is the fruit of deliberate design. If the laborious and painstaking work of the copyist in a picture gallery is not judged to be art, neither should the literal copying of nature's scenes, static or dynamic, be regarded as art. "Shelley," writes Francis Thomp-

son, "saw in nature not a picture set for his copying, but a palette set for his brush, not a habitation prepared for his inhabiting, but a *Coliseum whence he might quarry stones for his own palaces*. Even in his descriptive passages the dream character of his scenery is notorious : it is . . . a landscape that hovers athwart the heat and haze arising from his crackling fantasies. *The materials for such visionary Edens have evidently been accumulated from direct experience, but they are recomposed by him into such scenes as never mortal eye beheld.*"¹

The Thomistic philosophy teaches that there can be no such thing as communicable knowledge of the individual. Communicable knowledge can be only of the universal. The intelligible and the universal are one. The consequence is that a rapid decline in art will always attend on a decline in intellectuality. An age which manifests a feebleness in its mental life will inevitably prove to be an age which is powerless to produce or to appreciate art of any excellence. The present is an age which witnesses to a deplorable decline in the realm of the intellect. There is a growing divorce between human appreciations and reality because the power to penetrate to the core of reality, through the outer envelope of appearances, is rapidly disappearing. The effort at real thinking is an effort to which what is called the modern mind finds itself unequal. This reacts on art and the artist. The latter is always the product of his milieu. To respond to the needs of the day, he devotes his effort to registering, by the aid of a highly perfected technique, the phenomena of nature. This tendency is most perfectly exemplified in scenic art. Moving *pictures* are rapidly supplanting the legitimate drama. The avowed aim of the cinema is to present to the onlooker what the eye and the ear can lay hold of in the incidents that constitute the spectacle. There is meant to be conveyed little more than sense impressions.

¹ Essay on Shelley. Italics mine.

Little more is received than sense impressions. The only stimulus is to the imagination and the sensibility. The intellectual effort and the intellectual effect are reduced to a minimum. The audience pours out from these representations not with passions purified but almost literally reeling and drugged with sensation. What is worse, just as in the case of drug taking, the craving for the drugging of the sensibility becomes with each gratification more imperious and more exacting.

Painting, poetry, music and literature are affected by the prevalent disease. They, too, are suffering from intellectual anaemia. Poetry is becoming a desperate attempt to express the individual. Its language strives to embody the entirely subjective impressions, moods and emotions of the poet. It is not surprising that language rebels at the violence done to it. What is peculiar to one man cannot be common to another. Being incommunicable it is inexpressible. Nothing can be expressed except what is capable of being held in common with other men. If it lacks this potential "commonness" there is no sense in expressing it. For then such an experience would be understood only by the person having the experience. Much of modern poetry could be likened to the speaking with tongues to which S. Paul makes reference in the first epistle to the Corinthians. The words of the poet may bear sense, but what use do they serve unless they be understood. They cannot be understood unless there be somebody to interpret them. In this case there is nobody to interpret the poet's words except the poet himself. But he is inescapably imprisoned within his own individual experience and his individual expression of that experience. Art is essentially a communication, that is, it is essentially social.

The evaporation of the transcendental elements is even more pronounced in music than in poetry.

Even excluding syncopated and jazz music, which scarcely merit the name, modern compositions do not aid the soul to effect junction with the sublime or the ideal world. "They do not translate the listener into a world of beautiful sound which is without bounds. They do not give one the sense of floating timelessly on a tide of harmony."¹ These compositions may be striking; they command attention but the soul-moving power is absent. Appealing more to passion than to spirit, this imaginative music does not loiter around the soul. The soul is neither strengthened nor purified by listening to it. The fine colouring, the thematic treatment which makes the works of the great masters so captivating are not found in modern music.

In the prose works of literature, that enjoy most vogue in the modern world, the same decadence is observable. Language as vocabulary and expression has received a high development and has been polished to extreme smoothness in the course of the last hundred years. The technique of writing fairly correct and easily flowing prose can be acquired by a diligent study of models and by a fair amount of practice. The result is that the numbers of writers who get their works printed and secure a public has increased in recent times with great rapidity. But in the books that become "best sellers" there is little that survives the test of time. Not only is success "ephemeral" but it may be doubted if any other kind of success is sought. For in literature, as in the other forms of art, the chief aim seems to be to reflect the purely phenomenal aspects of human life—its moods, its passions, its trivial doings, its kaleidoscopic changes and its transient fashions. Modern critics are warm in their praise of writings which do little more than record, in easy and very readable prose, the obvious facts, experiences, reactions and opinions of a life that is utterly

¹ Quoted from *Faith of a Moralist*, p. 91. A. E. Taylor.

commonplace. A reader who is reflective and looks for real art, will, in reading books of this type, have the sensation of gliding effortlessly on the mere surface of existence. He glides but glides objectlessly. Nothing enduring is laid hold of, no depths are touched, no philosophy insinuated, and no ultimates discovered. Such reading may be a pleasant pastime, but it leaves the soul with the sense of being brought up against a bare and baffling cul-de-sac. It has been led to nowhere and its journey ends only in hunger and dissatisfaction.

There has been much talk recently of healing the age-long breach between Christianity and art. A more pressing problem is to re-establish contact between artistic production and the real. Art has become decadent not precisely because it has become unchristian but because it has become untruthful. In the same sense that the great Christian apologist spoke of the mind naturally Christian, it may be said that all art that is true art is bound to be in a certain sense Christian. It certainly cannot be anti-Christian. For Christianity is the synthesis of all truth. Art to be real art must be true to nature. To be true to nature is to be, to that extent, Christian. The revival of Christian art that is so much needed is not the revival of art dealing with religious themes, but the revival of art reflecting a true Philosophy of life. Christian art must not be confounded with religious art. Art can be perfectly Christian without being specifically religious. But it cannot be Christian unless it grows out of a social setting in which Christian values are taken for granted and are the assumptions in every process of thought, speculative and practical. The artist, painter, or dramatist can deal with themes that are "secular",¹ and yet if his treatment is governed by an intuition of the truly beautiful,

¹ The word "secular" is used here in the sense of what is not specifically religious and not in the sense of "anti-religious" or "ir-religious".

his work can be termed Catholic. For beauty is nothing else but the splendidly universal laid hold of by the particular and revealed through it. To reconcile the drama with Christianity, the dramatist has not to abandon the presentation of the play and inter-play of human passions : he has but to trace the tragedy, pathos or comedy of human life on a background of universally accepted Christian values.

Art cannot flourish unless in a "milieu" which is permeated by a sound philosophy. Where the sense of true values is gone, where there has been lost a hold on fixed and indisputable standards of the true and the good there must necessarily follow a loss of the sense of the beautiful. The relationship of the three is so close as to render this inevitable. The cult of the beautiful must disappear with the loss of the love of truth : it will disappear even when truth, though it has not ceased to be loved, has come to be regarded as unattainable. This principle throws light on the positive cult of ugliness which is one of the alarming symptoms of the grievous intellectual illness into which the modern world has fallen.

To re-establish Christian art all that is required is that there be artists who think Christianly. The aim of the artist is not to teach, but to unveil what is hidden. The worker in colours, or marble, or harmonious words must not be inspired, in the actual exercise of his artistic faculty, by any other purpose than that of effecting a work which shall be beautiful—a work which shall clearly radiate the fair conceptions of his intelligence. Any attempt to teach a lesson, point out a moral, uphold a thesis, or to impose an emotion will vitiate his art. The form of beauty to reveal must alone dominate, control and direct all his activities.

Every attempt to make the artistic production sustain a thesis is an adulteration of art. Propagandist art is almost a contradiction in terms. The intrusion of any intention into the active creation of the artist

other than that of effecting a work that shall be beautiful is a sin against art. It will result in the fabrication of something hybrid, something which will be in part the product of the artistic faculty, and in part the outcome of thought unrelated to art.¹ Unless, therefore, the artist's will is wholly subjected to beauty, in all respects beautiful, his work will suffer. To achieve a work of Catholic art, all that is needed is that the worker be a true artist, be faithful to his art, and have a right intuition of the beautiful. That his intuitions be unerring, it is necessary that his mind should be formed to the true, that is, the Catholic philosophy of life. It is only that philosophy which integrates the whole of truth and is alone the faithfully intelligible expression of reality. The artist need not be a philosopher but he must live in an atmosphere in which his mind imbibes a true philosophy. The man who is endowed with the artistic faculty and lives in a "milieu" which accepts the Christian concept of the Cosmos, and is himself in mental harmony with this concept, is in a position to effect a work of Christian art. And this may happen even if in the regulation of his own personal conduct he may fail to square his actions with his beliefs. But such work will be impossible for him when he frames his philosophy to square with his perversity.

There is, according to S. Thomas, such a thing as natural inspiration.² He agrees in this with Aristotle. The artist is a man inspired in the natural order. As such he has visions not given to other men. But like other men he may exhibit contradiction in his life. At moments of artistic inspiration he can be true to his best self and in harmony with the ideal of beauty revealed to him. At other times he can yield to the influence of the sordid, the mean and the ugly. An artist could

¹ cf Maritain. *Art et Scolastique*, pp. 108, 109 and again 114.

² *vide* St. Th. I., II. Q 68 a. 1 and 2.

possibly be a poor Christian in his conduct, and yet a true Christian in his art. But much more perfectly will he realize in his work the ideal of Christian beauty if he approach his work with passions purified and with a will rectified in regard to his true final end as man. The rectitude of his will, the moral excellence of his character will be a powerful support for the exercise of his artistic faculty. It will preserve him from the temptation of making his pursuit of the beautiful subserve unworthy purposes or pander to ignoble instincts. "Art demands much calm," says Fra Angelico, "and in order that one paint the things of Christ, one must live in union with Christ."¹ But when this has been conceded, it remains true that if the artist has the Christian mind, and aims uniquely at effecting a work of beauty, the product of his hands will be found to conform to the standards of a Christian society.

E. LEEN, C.S.Sp.

¹ Maritain. *Art et Scolastique*, p. 116.

THE PRINCIPLES AND METHOD OF THE J.O.C.

THIS paper has arisen out of a translation made of the speeches delivered by Canon Cardyn at the International Congress of the J.O.C. at Brussels in August 1935. It was considered, and no doubt rightly, that speeches were best left spoken, and that the purpose of the paper would be better served if a free synopsis were made instead. This necessitates that the reader should trust the judgement of the maker of the synopsis. However, there is always one way out of the difficulty, namely, to refer to the original *Semaine d' Études Internationales de la J.O.C.*, obtainable from 79 Boulevard Poincaré, Bruxelles, Belgium. Though much has been omitted, the wording still remains that of Canon Cardyn.

Some preliminary remarks are perhaps necessary. J.O.C. stands for Jeunesse Ouvrière Chrétienne, and is the authorized Catholic Action for manual workers in Belgium, approximately from the time they leave school until they marry or cease to be "Youth". The exact ages are not important, each country will have to decide that for itself. This organization, begun in Belgium just after the war—though there had been a beginning before the war—has now gone beyond the frontiers of that little country and spread all over the world. These are the facts :

Canon Cardyn was born of working-class people. He was and remains one of them. At a very early age he resolved to do all in his power to help the workers. He became a priest, and set about studying social conditions. He was influenced by some trade union leaders he met in England, and especially by their method of getting to the worker, by taking an interest in his environment and doing all in their power to improve it.

Like all great things it began very small. Before

the war he had two young men, staunch Catholics, who joined at his bidding the society of St. Vincent de Paul ; this, in order to be able to get into touch with the people and their conditions of life. Fr. Cardyn saw more and more plainly that the problem before him was that of the **YOUNG WORKER AND HOW TO SAVE HIM AND HER.**

The next stage in his venture is the one that is at the root of all his mighty success.

(a) J.O.C. studied the conditions with the view to **DOING SOMETHING ABOUT THEM.**

(b) These youths, young men and young women, were being trained by him to propagate their ideas among their own fellows. How they did it we shall see later.

The study circles developed before the war, but at the armistice many of the leaders had been killed. Then, reformed after the war, when there were 200 members, J.O.C. launched out on a newspaper. That was in 1920, and it was only a monthly paper. There were other priests and laymen in the Walloon country, at Antwerp and elsewhere, doing much the same work. The next few years up till 1925 marked a period of getting into touch with one another and developing a real practical plan of campaign. In 1924 there was a Congress at Brussels at which were present 100 priests all interested in such work. This was the turning point, when from a struggling innovation, an oddity, the movement became quite simply national. The spirit of conquest had come. These men were going to win back the working classes away from materialism to Christ. They did and are doing so. In March 1925 Canon Cardyn was received in private audience by Pius XI, who said : "Yes, you must organize them, and in great numbers. You must have the ambition of winning the masses.

Each worker's soul has an infinite value, and so long as one of them still remains outside the influence of Christ and His Church our mission is not finished." Figures alone will show what strides the movement has made. In April 600 delegates met in Brussels. Later in the year there was a week's training for the "Militants". These are the apostles of the movement. The priest cannot go and work like the workman in the factory. In any case, even if he did he would be pushed aside. What was, and is, needed is a workman himself, to convert, to influence in a Christian way, his surroundings. So a social week was set aside for the training of such apostles. Fifty were expected, 170 went.

At the Congress of Namur in 1926 there were 1500 delegates. In 1927 in the Red districts of Paris, Jocism was started. It was the beginning of the universal mission of the J.O.C. Then there were 2000 delegates, next 3500, then 6000, and so it went on. In 1930 there was a total number of 70,000 Jocists. In Brussels, August 1935, 100,000 were present. In Paris in 1937, after ten years' struggle in France, again that figure was reached. This time the delegates were mostly French, not Belgian.

Now we return to the apotheosis, the international Congress held in August 1935. I translate the account of an eyewitness: "There is no doubt that this congress was an 'event'. The proof lies in the place given to it in the secular Press. For example, the accounts in the *Excelsior* and the *Paris-Soir* gave the figures as 100,000 persons. France alone was represented by 6000 jocists.

"It is a marvel how all that youth was able to assemble in the most perfect order, first of all in the vast park of Laeken, then, after a light meal, in the stadium of Heysel; a marvel that in the stadium 1600 Jocists were able, without the slightest hitch, to form figures and carry on a dramatic dialogue in

choirs for an hour and a half, after only one practice all together, the night before. There is discipline for you.

"For a whole year, the Belgian Jocists, in teams of nine, had prepared that day down to its smallest details. For a year they had been praying for the success of this manifestation which was to have such incalculable influence on public opinion. To prayer they added sacrifices. Twenty thick albums contain a list of the striking privations that they promised and inflicted upon themselves for that intention. Thirty-three militants had offered up their death that year 'For the Congress'."

Let us turn now to the principles and the method that have produced these marvellous results. The workers, gone pagan, hating Christianity, returning in vast numbers, and returning as conquerors, as apostles ; that was the dream of the zealous priests of before the war, who saw the misery and tragedy of the apostasy of the workers. The dream is now coming true.

At this point we begin the synopsis of Canon Cardyn's exposition of his principles and method.

Three truths are vital to this problem of the Christianizing of the workers of the world.

1. The eternal and temporal destiny of each and every worker.
2. The flagrant contradiction there is between the real conditions lived in by the workers and their eternal destiny.
3. The need to organize the workers as a body in order to fight for and conquer that destiny.

First truth. The young workers are not machines, animals, slaves. They are the collaborators and heirs of God. Further, the spiritual life and working life

of the workers are not separate, but two sides of the same thing. For fish the natural environment is water, for trees it is the earth, for the young worker it is his social environment. The worker's eternal destiny is won through this earthly life, the **WHOLE** earthly life with all its aspects: corporal, moral, intellectual, emotional, professional, social, and public. That truth which is fundamental and which we cannot too often recall is at the root of all Jocism.

Second Truth. (Of this truth we are already only too painfully aware and the translator takes the liberty to omit it, in order to save space.)

Third Truth. There is only one way of solving the problem; that is by the workers themselves getting together in order to conquer their double yet single destiny. No solution from outside, from among the clergy, relatives, teachers, employers, public works. All these can and must help, but they cannot take the place of the workers themselves. It is *their* job.

Nor is the solution to be found in the transformation of political institutions, nor in economic reforms. A regime may be a hindrance or a help, but the most ideal regime will not solve our problem. Our need is men, human activity. Only an organization of the young workers will do, with the object of conquering their eternal and temporal destiny. It must be an organization, run by, made up of, and for the sake of, the young workers. It must be **ADAPTED** specially to their age, their conditions, their future. The organization must be local, regional, national; one, disciplined, autonomous, alive, conquering, capable of influencing and drawing the mass of the young workers.

It must be a school for conquering their lay life; not a school in a laboratory, a seminary, a knitting class, but in and for real life, with its real difficulties and problems. A school for the conquest of their

surroundings, in the absence of, and at a distance from, the priest, in the real surroundings that are the framework and provider of their life.

It is to be a school for the mass, not for a minority. *Isolated conquest, dispersed and individual, is impossible and ineffectual in the concrete conditions of modern life.*

In order to make this an effective organization, there must be an *élite*. This picked body will come from the mass, and act on the mass. But the mass itself will not be an inert body, but share with team spirit in the team work of the whole.

THE MAKING OF MILITANTS

Fundamentally the J.O.C. is not for some goody-goodies but for the mass, for the last among the last. The young workers need to be organized for this purpose. In this conquest we do not separate the two *fundamental problems*: that of the conquest and formation of the mass, and that of the conquest and formation of the *élite*.

Militants and members learn to SEE, JUDGE, ACT. They see what their destiny should be, they judge the present conditions, they act, in order to make the two fit.

Some may say, "Isn't this dangerous, and anyhow, Utopian?" "Doesn't this sort of thing aid and abet class war?"

The answer is that it all depends on the spirit, and the aim, or, as we say, the conquests to be won. In this case there is no danger; for the young worker, who has learned his high destiny, his vocation, is proud of being able, in his circumstances, by his life, and work, to share in the work of Christ and His Kingdom.

We want to conquer the vast mass of young workers whose living conditions are actually in contradiction

with their eternal and temporal destiny, and who nevertheless must attain that destiny. Jocism is the solution to that problem ; that is the key to the movement, the central point in the training of the militants.

The militants are the heart of the movement, the staff officers, the leaders in the parish, in the factory, in that street, that city. Locally, regionally, nationally, they form a united front. From first to last they are laymen. Without these, Jocism is nothing. Jocism will be as good or as feeble as the militants will make it.

We must remember, no militant without the priest. He is the moulder of the militants. He will give them faith in conquest and the tactics of conquest. For this end he will put his whole heart and knowledge, and all the sacerdotal means at his disposal, at the service of the Jocist militants, the troops of the Church militant of whom he is the spiritual father.

We must not separate the formation of the militants from the organization of the movement or from the Jocist action. The training of the militants must be done within the organization and activities of Jocism.

Whom do we call militants ? Some will be 100 per cent, some 1 per cent. We must not imagine we need 100 per cent immediately. Who would dare to say he was a 100 per cent ? We must always begin by taking the militants just as they are. If they are communists, socialists, never mind. We must say, "From that fellow there I am going to make a militant." There are no ready-made militants to be had. They must be formed.

We mean by a militant, someone who, first and above all, for his whole life as a young worker, conquers himself and others for their eternal and temporal destiny. We say, first self before others. But this is not a priority of time but of intention. A militant is not one because he speechifies. A Jocist who speaks

marvellously from the rostrum and can rouse enthusiasm, but who, five minutes later, misconducts himself with a girl, is not worthy to be a militant ; he is a Judas.

The little core of militants with whom we begin is formed by making a local section on the spot, in doing some propaganda, in making house-to-house visits, in getting into contact with the regional, and so with the national, organization. They must accept before God and the Jocist movement the responsibility of helping that mass of young workers with whom they live to attain their eternal and temporal destiny.

The ambition of Jocism is to have one militant to every five or six members. The dominant passion of the priests and militants must be to increase and multiply these militants.

The doctrinal formation of the militants must be very profound. It is not a matter of exams. These truths must be learned as truths to be lived, conquered. Our programme of study is then inseparable from our programme of action. All study must be followed up by immediate realization. We have already done the sacraments on these lines. Take for example, Baptism. Our militants had with them some unbaptized fellow workers. They had never, up to then, asked themselves the question, "Is my neighbour baptized ?" These militants then went out to conquer the unbaptized workers. In the workshops the wildest absurdities are uttered about Confession, and monstrous things about priests. Our militants had to conquer the doctrine of Confession. On the occasion of the Easter Confession Campaign, the number brought back to their duties in this way is beyond counting.

And some people come and tell me, "We give so many courses in the liturgy, in apologetics, etc." We reply that, if the formation is lessons, nine out of the ten workmen understand nothing. Perhaps you

have founded a university, but you have not by so doing established Catholic Action.

There are saints among the Jocists. The J.O.C. is a school of sanctity. It is wonderful how our Jocists carry through with their principles. While working at night in the blast furnaces, or from morning till night in the workshops or mills, they manage to live united to our Lord all the day long. Their table, their loom, their machine, becomes an altar. Sometimes they have the Jocist prayer before them. From time to time they say, "Jesus, I unite myself to You." They offer up their sacrifices to their heavenly Father, "I am a priest with You, Jesus, and may all the looms, all the tables, become so many altars. May Jesus Christ, Creator, Redeemer, our Last End, be glorified, He who gave Himself passionately for all the Working Class and all humanity."

The priest must train the militants, but they train each other among themselves. Consequently there must be reunions of militants, where they share their experiences. With us every study circle is simply doctrinal preparation for action. Each militant is a catechist.

We have now come to the most intimate part of the training, namely, the religious formation, the heart of all formation. In regard to this we will never consider ourselves too ambitious. It is extraordinary how much we need a change of view on this point. Sanctity is for religious, priests, so they say. But sanctity is necessary in the barracks, in the factories, just as much as in the convent. How do you think we are going to turn the devil out of his lair if we have not got some saints there? "Man of little faith," I often say to myself. And it is true. When we realize what marvellous results we get from Jocists, it makes one amazed.

As for method. We begin with what we call the apprenticeship of charity. We train them to love

their neighbour. We say, "Love your fellow-workers, respect that working girl." They soon understand that. When they are told, "Love your companions like brothers, for they are your brothers in work", they ask why? You see, we have begun. "Because they are the brothers of Jesus Christ, our Lord, who has loved souls, and let himself be killed for us, and who is for ever giving himself in the Church." Then they understand how to serve God in Christ, and they serve souls as Christ serves them. They want to conquer. All the chaplains can tell stories of astounding religious transformations effected in this way. "Per ipsum, cum ipso, in ipso."

Optimism is needed in order to form militants. When I began I had to teach my first team of young workers how to write, how to write an apology to their employer.

The laity in the apostolate, if not new in its essence or spirit, is new in its form, organization and usefulness. Pope Pius XI, by making it the central idea of his pontificate will have revolutionized the Church. May all the clergy realize the significance of this, so that the whole Church, the mystical body of Christ, may be transformed into an apostolate, all the members thus sharing in the conquering life of the Head.

Let us end with the words of the Pope himself. They are part of a letter written to the Belgian Hierarchy on the occasion of this Congress in 1935.

"It is permissible to prophesy that it (J.O.C.) will spread yet more widely, adapting itself to the different local circumstances, and submitting to the requirements of the Bishops.

"It could not be otherwise, since it is an authentic form of Catholic Action, suited to the present time."

COLUMBA CARY-ELWES, O.S.B.

CALVIN, USURY AND THE REFORMATION

THE sixteenth century saw revolutionary changes in almost every department of life—religious, moral, political and social. With these changes coincided an enormous expansion of commercial activity and the final collapse of the whole economic system on which the Middle Ages had been built. In the midst of this upheaval stands John Calvin, the man who gave system to the Reformation theology, and (it is said) the man who laid the foundations of its economic code. It was Calvin, we are told, who, by his penetrating analysis of the morality of money-lending, broke away from the ancient ecclesiastical prohibition of usury and, in sanctioning the taking of interest on money loans, gave his blessing to the development of big business and capitalist enterprise. Sir William Ashley says: "The final breach with the medieval doctrine among those outside the Roman Communion came from Calvin, who, in a celebrated letter to *Æcolampadius* (first printed in 1575), followed the French jurist *Dumoulin* (or *Molinaeus*) in denying that a payment for the use of money was in itself sinful. He pointed out the absurdity of regarding money as barren when it was possible to purchase with it property from which a revenue could be obtained."¹ And the celebrated historian concludes: "Calvin's teaching was, therefore, in a very real sense, a turning-point in the history of European thought." Professor R. H. Tawney's estimate is more reserved. "The picture of Calvin, the organizer and disciplinarian, as the parent of laxity in social ethics is a legend." Yet he insists that both his critics and defenders have been right in regarding Calvin's teaching as a watershed. "What he did was to change the plane on which the discussion was conducted, by treating the ethics of money-

¹ *Economic History*, Vol. I, Pt. ii, pp. 458-459.

lending, not as a matter to be decided by an appeal to a special body of doctrine on the subject of usury, but as a particular case of the general problem of the social relations of a Christian community, which must be solved in the light of existing circumstances."¹ The eminent French historian M. Henri Hauser sums up his own most recent study of the question by suggesting that Calvin's contribution to the solution of the problem of interest-taking was to make it lawful in theory while perhaps forbidden in practice, whereas the medieval view had made it unlawful in theory though possibly permitted in practice.²

A more careful reading of Calvin's writing on the subject, however, leaves one with some doubts. The reformer himself constantly insists that in this matter it is not the names which count but the thing itself which must be examined. "Tu quoque", one is inclined to murmur; for in his discussion he lumps together all forms of interest-taking under the name of usury, and through not distinguishing either the things or the names he makes confusion worse confounded. He seems to be unaware of the progress of Catholic teaching on the matter, and far from bringing to the discussion the qualities of a "hard-headed lawyer", as Mr. Tawney suggests, he approaches it with the prolixities, the vagueness and the contradictions of a well-meaning muddler.

By the end of the Middle Ages theologians had come to recognize that the payment of interest on some forms of loan was not in itself unlawful. A sum of money could be used to buy a rent-charge or annuity (*census*). Originally applied to land under

¹ *A Discourse Upon Usury* by Thomas Wilson (1925). Introduction, especially pp. 111-121. See also *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* (1926), pp. 102-111.

² *Les Débuts du Capitalisme* (1931). Ch. II, "Les Idées Economiques de Calvin" is an expansion of a paper originally published in *Mélanges d'Histoire offerts à Henri Pirenne*, Bruxelles (1926). M. Hauser's work was the inspiration of the present study, and to him I owe the dating of Calvin's writings.

production, the practice had been extended by the end of the fifteenth century to include houses and shops, and even to the sale of market and toll rights. In 1452 Pope Nicholas V declared that a rent-charge need not be on income-bearing property. Pope Pius V reversed this decision in 1569, but Gregory XIII seems to have confirmed the Bull of Nicholas V, at least for the Sicilies. Several forms of insurance were likewise allowed, as were contracts of partnership where, together with hope of profit, risk of capital was shared. The public loans of Princes and states had been considered to be outside the canonical prohibition, and before the Lutheran upheaval the German theologian John Eck had been trying to win approval for the *Contractus Trinus* or triple contract, in which the lender entered into a contract of partnership, took out an insurance against loss of capital, and also insured himself for a fixed return on his money, all with the same person. Usury, on the other hand, was explicitly condemned in the Canon Law. It had been defined by St. Thomas as receiving a price for the use of money which was lent (*pecunia mutuata*); that is, money the ownership of which had changed hands according to the contract known as *mutuum*. This contract could exist only with regard to fungible goods such as wine, bread and money, which are used up in being first used, and whose use and ownership cannot be separated. The sin of usury consisted in the charge made for the use of such things, as though their use could be separated from their ownership. It was in fact charging twice for the same thing. By the sixteenth century, too, the canonists looked on a guaranteed return from a trading venture as usurious. "Quicquid sorti accedit, subaudi per pactum vel exactionem, usura est." As Mr. Tawney puts it, "Medieval opinion, which did not object to profits, provided they were reasonable, had no mercy for

the debenture holder."¹ Pope Leo X, in the Bull *Inter Multiplices* (1515), which allowed the recently founded *Montes Pietatis* to charge a small amount as interest on loans, seems to have approved the definition that usury is "the attempt to draw profit and increment without labour or cost, or risk from the use of a thing which does not bear fruit".²

The canonical prohibition was evaded by a variety of subterfuges which need not be considered here, but it was also generally recognized that circumstances might be such that the lender of money would be justified in charging interest as compensation, not *ex ipso mutuo*, but in virtue of some other title. These extrinsic titles, as they were called, fell under four heads: risk of losing the capital lent (*periculum sortis*); loss through delay in repayment of the loan (*poena conventionalis* or *titulus ex mora*); loss suffered because of the loan (*damnum emergens*); and diminution of profits (*lucrum cessans*). St. Thomas had denied the validity of the last title, for one cannot be compensated for what one has not yet got; but Ashley points out that in the fifteenth century, as opportunities of investment increased, the theologians began to regard the title as morally justifiable. For a merchant or trader, presumption of loss was so strong that proof was dispensed with.³

Calvin was a prolific writer with, in his less formal work, a somewhat nervous style. He deals with the question of usury in seven places, in scriptural commentaries, sermons or letters. The most famous of these is the letter written "to one of his friends",

¹ Introduction to Wilson's *Discourse*, p. 109. Cf. Ashley, *op. cit.* p. 420.

² *Ea est propria usurarum interpretatio, quando videlicet, ex usu rei quae non germinat, nullo labore, nullo sumptu, nullo periculo, lucrum fetusque conquiri studetur.*

³ *Economic History*, Vol. I, Pt. ii. Ashley's chapter on the canonist doctrine is still one of the best discussions of the question in English. There are useful brief accounts of the teaching of earlier English theologians in M. Beer's *Early British Economics*.

which is in fact a little treatise on the subject. It was written in November or December 1545, and was an answer to Claude de Sachins, who had written to Calvin for advice. A Latin translation is given in Calvin's *Epistolae et Responsa*, under the title *De Usuris Responsum*, published at Geneva in 1575.¹ The letter is Calvin's earliest treatment of the subject. I think, too, in spite of its severity, that it represents his most lax position. Certainly in the two important writings of 1556 he is notably more severe. It is also his fullest discussion of the matter ; but it will perhaps be useful to note first of all what he says in other places.

He attacks all those fictitious forms which were used to conceal usury, as when the borrower sells goods worth 40 sols and makes out a bill for 60.² He has also firmly in mind the obligation, taught by all contemporary moralists, of helping the poor in need. He insists very strongly that to take interest on a loan to a poor person is robbery in the sight of God, and notes that the permission of the civil law does not excuse from sin. Even the legal 5 per cent may be sinful.³ In this sermon he admits the validity of the title *ex mora* ; yet in his commentary on the Eighth Commandment he condemns the title, together with that of *lucrum cessans*, as unworthy pieces of trickery invented by cunning men to deceive God,

¹ Ashley (op. cit. p. 458) says that the letter was written to Ecolampadius and was first published in 1575. The same mistake is made by Tawney (op. cit. p. 136), Professor G. O'Brien, Dr. Böhm-Bawerk and others. Calvin's reply was certainly widely known in 1549, when Utenhoveius wrote from London on the same subject. See Hauser (op. cit. p. 47), or, better, E. Doumergue, *Jean Calvin*, Vol V, pp. 687-688. Both authors give faulty references to Calvin's works. These occupy fifty-nine volumes in the monumental *Corpus Reformationum*, and are usually quoted as *Calvini Opera*.

² Sermon on Deut. xxiii, 18-20, March 1556. *Calvini Opera*, Vol. XXVIII, col. 119.

³ "Or est-ce à dire pourtant qu'il soit toujours licite de prendre cinq pour cent ? Nenni. Car si un homme vient à moy, et qu'il soit en disette : il est certain que quelque excuse que j'amie ne quand je prendray de luy quelque tribut, ie seray réputé larron et usurier devant Dieu ; car il est en disette, ie doy luy subvenir ; et ie ne le fay pas." *Ibid.*, col. 121.

subterfuges which can always be invoked to cover usury, for in that age a man could always claim that he could have used his money profitably.¹ In this respect Calvin is more severe than contemporary Catholic theologians, takes no account of their distinctions, and seems to condemn every extrinsic title as "*integumentum rei odiosae*". Yet in dealing with the scriptural prohibitions he holds that these apply only to loans to the poor, "*nonnisi de pauperibus haberi sermonem*", and that interest may be taken from the rich, "*ideoque si cum divitibus negotium sit, liberum jus foenerandi permitti*". And so, if we examine the thing and not merely the words, we must conclude that all usury cannot be entirely condemned, "*usuras quaslibet absque exceptione damnare nulla patitur ratio*". He then gives two examples to illustrate his argument, and in doing so causes more confusion, for I think it may be said with confidence that none but the most rigid theologian would have condemned as usurious either of the transactions which Calvin describes.

The first is simply a case of delay in the repayment of a loan, and here Calvin flatly contradicts what he has just said about the validity of extrinsic titles.² In the second case, which we shall see again, Calvin imagines a man borrowing money to buy property. May not the lender share in the profit or

¹ Semper enim excogitant homines astuti captiunculas quibus Deum illudant. Sic quum foeneris nomen omnes detestarentur, suppositum fuit alterum quod honesto colore odium effugeret: usuram enim vocarunt quasi compensationem damni, quanti intererat pecuniae suae usu carere. Atqui nullum est foeneris genus cui speciosum hunc titulum obtendere non liceat. Nam quisquis praesentem habet pecuniam, ubi eam mutuo daturus est utilem sibi fore causabitur si quid emat, et singulis momentis lucrandi materiam offerri. Ita semper erit compensationi locus, quando nemo creditor sine damno pecuniam alteri numerabit. Ita nomen usurae, quum re ipsa tantundem valeat ac foenus integumentum est rei odiosae: quasi vero talibus cavillis se a Dei iudicio expediant, ubi sola integritas ad defensionem valeat. *Opera*, XXIV, 681 (1556).

² Debitor si tergiversando tempus extraxerit cum dispendio et molestia creditoris, an consentaneum erit eum ex mala fide et frustratione lucrum capere? Nemo certe (ut arbitror) negabit usuras creditoris solvendas esse praeter sortem, ut pensetur ejus jactura. *Ibid.*, 682.

revenue from the land till the principal be repaid? To do so is no worse than buying the land outright.¹ Any Catholic moralist would have agreed with him that such a transaction is perfectly lawful, either as a rent-charge or as a contract of partnership, or even under the extrinsic title *damnum emergens*. Calvin ignores all this and falls back on a vague rule that he will not condemn usury which does not offend equity nor oppress the borrower. The golden rule is the law of equity. "Unde sequitur usuras hodie non esse illicitas nisi cum aequitate et fraterna coniunctione pugnant."

The argument in the commentary on Ezechiel xviii, 8, is much the same. *Usura, foenus, interesse*, are all words cloaking the same malice. Yet again the conclusion is vague. There may be cases where usury "non possit praecise damnari", but it can scarcely happen that it is not sinful; "et ideo optandum esset, nomen ipsum tam foeneris quam usurae sepultum esse et deletum ex hominum memoria".²

The sermon LXXXIV on Job xxii and the commentary on Psalm XV cover almost the same ground.³ There must be hardly a single interest-taker in the world who is not also an extortioner given to the pursuit of wicked and filthy gain; yet profit-taking which does no harm cannot be absolutely condemned.

In a letter dated 28 April, 1556, Calvin is very cautious, refuses to give an opinion, especially as a third party is in question, and ends by referring to the golden rule, "ne videlicet faciamus alteri quod factum non vellemus nobis".⁴ In another letter to

¹ Si quis locuples qui erit in suis nummis, fundum emere volens, partem aliquam summae ab altero mutuetur, qui pecuniam numerat, annon poterit ex fundi reditu fructum aliquem percipere, donec sors repraesentata fuerit? Multa ejus generis quotidie accidunt, ubi, quod ad aequitatem spectat, usura nihilo deterior erit quam emptio.

² *Opera*, XL, col. 432. Written 1563, published 1565.

³ *Opera*, XXXIV, 283; XXXI, 147 (1557).

⁴ *Opera*, X (pars prior), 264.

a Calvinist minister, François de Morel, he is very severe on the whole question of trading. It leads to calumnies and scandals, and takes a minister away from his calling. So, rather than trade, a minister may lend money at interest. But, says Calvin, he must not lend for certain profit, "ne videlicet certum redditum vel summam sibi praecise pendi stipuletur". Rather should he make over his money to an honest man, and share in the profits he makes.¹ Here again Calvin is merely giving accepted Catholic teaching, but without the important Catholic distinctions.

All these examples show that on the whole Calvin was more severe than the Catholic theologians, that he tended to apply the term usury to all forms of interest-taking indiscriminately, and that he had no clear idea of the reasons which were being put forward to defend the payment of interest on loans under certain conditions. I think he may with justice be accused of being muddle-headed. An analysis of the "famous letter" to de Sachins, Calvin's fullest discussion of the subject, tends to confirm this judgment.

He begins the letter with a survey of the usual scriptural texts condemning usury (Deut. xxiii, 19; Ps. lv, 12; Ezech. xxii, 12), and points out that the Vulgate *Usura* is a translation of the Hebrew words *Nesec* and *Tarbit*, which mean gnawing or biting. This was forbidden to the Jews, but the law was special to them and was not intended to bind us, for "nostra conjunctio hodie per omnia non respondet".² He then makes what seems to be a very precise statement, and one which has been widely quoted. "Non videmus igitur ita nobis interdictas simpliciter

¹ *Opera*, X, i, 262-263. This letter is dated January 1560. The French version, probably the original, is in Vol. XIX, 245-246, and is dated 1562.

² *Ep. et Res.*, p. 356. The idea recurs in the commentary on the Eighth Commandment. "Clare patet veterem populum ab usuris fuisse prohibitum, sed hanc fuisse partem ordinis politici fateri necesse est." *Opera*, XXIV, 682.

usuras, nisi quatenus repugnant tum aequitati tum charitati." In fact, however, because of his failure to define his terms, Calvin is only saying that, in spite of prohibitions, there may be circumstances which justify the taking of interest. As we have seen, similar sentences are not uncommon in his writings.

Then comes what has been claimed to be the core of Calvin's work, his analysis of the theory of the sterility of money, which he attributes to St. Ambrose and St. John Chrysostom. His argument is simple. If money is convertible into land or merchandise, and if on these it is lawful to charge rent or to make a profit, then equally well is it lawful to take interest directly on a loan of money. "Is it true that money does not breed? What about the sea? What about land? I receive rent for letting a house. Is that because money grows there? But from that which grows in the fields money is made. And the use of a house may be bought for money. What? Money is not more fruitful in trade than any possessions one may have? It is lawful to let a threshing-floor and charge rent, and is it wrong to take fruit or profit from money? What? When you buy a field do you think that money does not breed money? How do merchants make addition to their goods? By hard work, you say? Certainly I admit, what any child can see, that if you lock up money in a chest it will be barren. And so nobody borrows from us with the idea of leaving the money locked up and idle, and not put to profitable use. We must conclude, therefore, that such niceties of distinction may be persuasive at first sight, but if they are examined more closely they fade away of themselves, for there is nothing solid in them."¹ The same argu-

¹ *Opera* X, i, 247. The staccato French is not easy to render. I append the Latin from the text of 1575. This is far from being a literal translation of the French, and reads more like a glossed version. I do not know if Calvin ever sanctioned this translation. "Ratio Ambrosii quam etiam offert Chrysostomus, non est magni momenti. Pecunia non parit

ment is expressed in a terser form in the commentary on the Eighth Commandment, but in this case Calvin seems afraid to come to a conclusion.¹

M. Hauser several times refers to this argument against the sterility of money as though it were Calvin's great achievement. "*Pecunia pecuniam parit*, cette découverte a-t-elle été faite avant Calvin?"²

This seems to me to be an exaggeration, for the basis of Calvin's argument is a false comparison. It is admitted that a man may charge interest on the loan of a fruitful thing, such as a field. Therefore, says Calvin, surely he should be allowed to charge interest for the loan of money with which the borrower may easily buy a field or a property and so make profit. In that case the money itself may be considered as fruitful. It is nonsense to say *pecunia non parit pecuniam*. But Calvin's argument is no innovation. It had been known and discussed since the twelfth century at least, and had been rejected by all the theologians. St. Thomas says quite clearly that if profit is made from borrowed money the profit belongs to the borrower by reason of his industry, and to charge interest for that reason would be to

pecuniam. Quid mare? Quid domus ex cujus locatione pensionem percipio, an ex tectis et parietibus argentum proprie nascitur? Sed et terra producit et mari advehitur quod pecuniam deinde producat, et habitationis commoditas cum certa pecunia parari commutative solet. Quid si igitur plus ex negotiatione lucri percipi possit, quam ex fundi cujusvis proventu, an feretur qui fundum sterilem fortasse colono locaverit ex quo mercedem vel proventum recipiat sibi, qui ex pecunia fructum aliquem perciperit, non feretur? Et qui pecunia fundum acquirit, annon pecunia illa generat alteram annum pecuniam? Unde vero mercatoris lucrum: ex ipsius iniquis diligentia atque industria. Quis dubitat pecuniam vacuum inutilem omnino esse? Neque qui a me mutuam rogat vacuum apud se habere a me acceptam cogitat. Non ergo ex pecunia illa lucrum accedit, sed ex proventu. Illae igitur rationes subtiles quidem sunt et speciem quandam habent, sed ubi propius expenduntur reipsa concidunt." *Ep. et Res.*, p. 356.

¹ Nec vero arguta illa ratio Aristotelis consistit, foenus esse praeter naturam, quia pecunia sterilis est nec pecuniam parit: poterit enim ille quem dixi frustrator, ex aliena pecunia quaestum uberem facere negotiando, fundi emptor metet ac vindemiabit. *Opera*, XXIV, 682.

² Op. cit., p. 60. Cf. p. 55: "C'est là surtout qu'il montre son sens profond des réalités économiques, son intelligence du rôle joué en son temps par la monnaie et le crédit."

charge a man a price for his own industry.¹ M. Hauser himself quotes St. Antoninus of Florence: "Money is not profitable (*lucrosa*) of itself alone, but it may become profitable through its employment by merchants." But he dismisses this as an "affirmation isolée" which had no effect on later teaching. He would, however, have found the same argument in the saint's treatise *De Usuris*² and equally in St. Bernardine of Siena: "Money has not simply the character of money, but it has beyond this a productive character which we commonly call capital."³ In fact, all the scholastics recognized that money might, in proper conditions, be a source of profit.⁴

As usual, Calvin then introduces an illustration. One man has a great deal of property but very little money; another has plenty of ready cash and is on the lookout to buy property. The first asks him for a loan. He could, if he wished, buy some of the land, leave it in the present owner's possession, and receive from it an annual revenue until the owner could buy it back again. He could, in fact, constitute a rent-charge. Instead of this he lends the money and charges interest without more ado. Why, asks

¹ III Sent. dist. 37, art. 6 ad 4.

² Pecunia enim inquantum pretium venalium nullum confert lucrum nisi per industriam utentis: vendere ergo utilitatem proventum per mercativam industriam ei cui mutuata est, nihil aliud est, quam vendere sibi industriam et actus suos, quod est contra naturam. In *Tractatus Universi Juris*, T. VII, p. 79.

³ See O'Brien, *An Essay on Medieval Economic Teaching*, p. 181.

⁴ It is interesting to note that Gratian had already inserted in his *Decretum* a text attributed to St. John Chrysostom in which the same argument as Calvin's is analysed and refuted: "Unde super omnes mercatores plus maledictus est usurarius. Ipse namque rem datam a Deo, vendit non comparatam, ut mercator, et post foenus rem suam repetit, tollens aliena cum suis, mercator autem non repetit rem venditam. Ad hoc dicit aliquis: Qui agrum locat ut agrariam recipiat, aut domum, ut pensiones recipiat nonne est similis ei qui pecuniam dat ad usuram? Absit. Primum quidem quoniam pecunia. . . . Secundo, quoniam agrum habens arando accipit ex eo fructum, habens domum usum mansionis capit ex ea. Ideo qui locat agrum, vel domum, suum usum dare videtur, et pecuniam accipere, et quodammodo quasi commutare videtur cum lucro lucrum: ex pecunia reposita nullum usum capit. Tertio, ager vel domus utendo veterascit. Pecunia autem cum fuerit mutata (*sic*), nec minuitur, nec veterascit." P.I., Dist. LXXXVIII, Cap. xi. M. Hauser (op. cit., p. 56), seems to have missed the point of this.

Calvin, is the first contract allowable while the second is condemned? Surely the lender is more charitable in charging interest than in making the borrower mortgage his property.¹ But Calvin is begging the whole question when he suggests that the second contract is illegal. Precisely because the lender could have bought the rent-charge had he wished, and on account of the loan did not do so, any theologian would have agreed that he could claim compensation under the title *lucrum cessans*, a title which Calvin has dismissed with contempt as "*integumentum rei odiosae*".

The letter continues by laying down the seven conditions which must be fulfilled before interest on a loan may be charged. First, no charge may be made for loans to the poor. Secondly, the desire for gain must not lead to the neglect of charity and natural duty. Thirdly, the golden rule must not be broken: "*quidquid vultis facere homines vestri causa vos quoque perinde illorum causa facite.*" Fourthly, the borrower must gain from the loan at least as much as the charge made. (Is this the first distinction of productive and non-productive loans?) In the fifth place, the justice of the charge must be measured not according to the wickedness of men but according to the word of God. Sixthly, in these contracts attention must be paid more to public good than to private interest. And finally, the legal rate of interest must not be exceeded. As Mr. Tawney remarks, "A condonation of usury protected by such embarrassing entanglements can have offered but tepid consolation to the devout money-lender."

¹ Professor G. Harkness, whose *John Calvin, the Man and his Ethics* (New York. Henry Holt, 1931) is one of the few books in English dealing with this point, has here mistaken Calvin's meaning. She says that he "shows that borrowing money to buy a farm and paying interest to the lender who holds a mortgage is no more reprehensible than leasing a farm and paying rent" (p. 206). But Calvin's whole point is that the lender need not constitute a mortgage, but may simply lend at interest. Indeed, "*il fait plus aimablement avec son frère en accordant de l'usure que si il le contraignait à hypothéquer la pièce*".

It has been the purpose of this paper to suggest that Calvin's teaching is far from being a watershed or turning-point in the history of European thought in the way his apologists maintain. Calvin nowhere shows that he has grasped the fundamental reasons for the Church's condemnation of usury. He seems to have no clear idea of what he himself means by the word. He uses it in condemning some forms of interest and in admitting the legality of others. The result is confusion ; and this was all that was needed. There were not wanting business men and financiers in the sixteenth century who were only too ready to seize such a chance. The gradual adaptation of Catholic teaching to new conditons of economic life in the hands of the Catholic theologians, an adaptation which would have safeguarded justice and equity, was dislocated by the muddle-headedness of one of the leaders of the Reformation. The "turning-point" was not Calvin's teaching, but the use which the new financiers were able to make of his name. Usury lost its precise theological meaning, the news was spread that Calvin approved of it, while the restrictions and conditions he had laid down were soon forgotten. Finance had a new interest in the Reformation, and in the name of the great Reformer the devout money-lender found a heaven-sent salve for his none-too-sensitive conscience.

ANDREW BECK, A.A.

HOMILETICS

AS all the Masses this month emphasize, in one way or another, man's dependence upon God, it seems a good opportunity to set forth the principal truths concerning grace.

Ninth Sunday after Pentecost

"Save me, O God, by Thy name, and deliver me in Thy strength." (Introit. Ps. 53).

It is commonly held that man's first sin was one of pride. Certainly the Angels' was. Lucifer, dazzled by the magnificence of his natural perfections, and thinking that he was sufficient unto himself, refused to humble himself before God, who would raise him to a still higher plane, and was therefore cast out.

And similarly fell Adam, who, before he had eaten the forbidden fruit, had already given way to his desire to be as God, "knowing good and evil". All down the ages the same sin has constantly reappeared, not only in individuals, but sometimes infecting multitudes of men, taking the form of a special heresy, and sometimes, as seems to be the case today, becoming the dominant characteristic of nations.

Hence the Church, both in the person of her Founder and by the mouths of her teachers, has always taught the high importance—nay, the absolute necessity—of humility and of the sense of complete powerlessness without God's grace. Christ has told us that if we would enter the kingdom of heaven we must become as little children, and that without Him we can do nothing; St. Paul describes graphically the struggle between his higher desires and his lower appetites from which only the grace of Jesus Christ can rescue him, and even says that no man can call upon the Lord Jesus without the help of the Holy Ghost; while St. Augustine, to name but one of the Fathers, faced by heresy, spent years in hammering home the truth that, as far as our salvation is concerned, God is simply everything and we are nothing.

But to acknowledge, in general terms, our own powerlessness and God's omnipotence was not enough. Man's pride

may be kept under, but it is never killed, and never will be. Hence we find that, in the fifth century the Church, in her struggle with the heresy of Pelagius, had to fight upon this very point. And though Pelagius died 1400 years ago, and the Church clearly defined her position and God's revelation in condemning his heresy, let it not be thought that, in referring to his errors, we are wasting time in flogging a dead horse. The same errors, in an even deadlier form, are very much alive today, and there are many Catholics too, who, to their loss, are in these matters not fully instructed. Man's achievements, especially his victories over the forces of nature, in modern times have been so wonderful, and often so spectacular, that he has come to have an exaggerated idea of his own powers and to imagine that he is wholly self-sufficient. This is, of course, a commonplace ; but it means that men have wandered far from the truth, and that there is great need of instruction.

Nothing can well be more important than a realization of the truths that, of ourselves, we are absolutely incapable of gaining the end for which we are made, and that, in order to gain that end, God gives us of His infinite love and through Christ's merits, the real, positive gift which we call sanctifying or habitual grace, and which St. Peter does not hesitate to call a partaking of the divine nature.

The first truth is the foundation of all real humility ; it is also the necessary consequence of any right idea of God. Once let it be given that He is the Creator and we creatures, that He is infinite in the fullest sense, and it at once follows that, of ourselves and our own powers, we are unable to see Him face to face as He is, and to share eternally in the intimate society of His goodness, beauty, and glory. Yet we know from His revelation that it is for this that we are made.

And so we are forced to the second truth, which, moreover, is most clearly expressed in the pages of the New Testament. "Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John iii, 5). If Christ's words mean anything and are not mere rhetoric, how can a man be born again unless he be born into some new nature, just as, at his first birth, he is born into the nature of man ?

Nor have we any right to suppose that St. Paul writes just for the sake of writing, without meaning what he says ; and therefore when he tells his converts that the Christian is a "new creature" (Gal. vi, 14), he means them to understand that he is remade, made into something new, a thing which can be done, not by simply taking away something already possessed, but only by adding something real, something positive that was hitherto lacking. St. Peter calls us partakers of the divine nature, and again it is pertinent to ask if he is indulging in idle rhetoric, while, according to St. John, we are sons of God, not as any creature might be so called, but precisely because we are Christians.

Hence we read in the Catholic Catechism (qu. 280, p. 141) : "Habitual grace is a supernatural quality dwelling in the soul, by which man is made a partaker in the divine nature, a temple of the Holy Ghost, a friend of God, his adopted son, and heir to the glory of heaven, and so capable of performing acts meriting eternal life." Here we see the dignity and nobility of the Christian, of every one not cut off from God by mortal sin. The lowliest Catholic changed by grace into the adopted son of God, the beggar-woman a temple of the Holy Ghost, the crossing-sweeper an heir to the kingdom of heaven, we ourselves, God's friends, partakers of the divine nature, and, if we sin not, meriting, that is, truly deserving, eternal life. If ever the saying *noblesse oblige* had any meaning, it has here. Seeing what we were, and what God, in His love, has made us, seeing how He has given us a nobility far exceeding any earthly dignity, it would seem that, if we can only realize something of what grace is, the defilement of God's temple by sin should be impossible.

Tenth Sunday after Pentecost

"No man can say the Lord Jesus but by the Holy Ghost."
(Epistle, I Cor., xii, 3.)

We have seen something of the change wrought in men by habitual grace. It makes us to be the sons of God, the temples of the Holy Ghost and the heirs of eternal glory, whereas we had hitherto been the children of wrath, the slaves of the devil and God's enemies.

God's enemies ! A terrible name, and one to make us tremble. But to say that we are His enemies is not to say that He is not our friend, that we are beyond the reach of His compassion or outside the orbit of His love. To think that would be to forget that Jesus wept over Jerusalem, that Christ is the Good Shepherd who goes in search of the lost sheep, that He came to call sinners, that He died for all and that God wishes all to be saved. To think that would be to abandon all hope of salvation and to open the door to despair since, as we shall see, the first call must, in every case, come from God, and no man can take even the first halting step upon the road that leads to heaven, unless God, of His merciful love, freely urges him to it.

Therefore we see at once that, besides habitual grace, which is a permanent quality in the soul making us God's friends, there is another sort of grace which is given even to His enemies. This is actual grace, and this, both in its necessity and in some of its effects, we have now to consider. And first, we must be clear as to what we mean. Such things as the existence of the church, the performance of some miracle, the reading of the Scriptures, the hearing of a sermon or the good example of Catholic neighbours may, in one sense, be called graces. God often uses such things as the occasion or means of calling a man, or as a channel for His inspiration. Many a sinner has been converted by a sermon. St. Ignatius was turned from a worldly life through reading the lives of the Saints, St. Francis Borgia through looking upon the corpse of a powerful queen. But these things are all external to us. Of themselves they are powerless to influence us, and though God often, or even ordinarily, makes use of them, they are not really necessary. So when we speak of actual grace or graces, it is not of such exterior things that we speak, but rather of the inward call from God that summons us to some good deed. It may be an illumination of the mind, removing a doubt ; it may be a moving or urging of the will ; the voice of conscience warning us against some contemplated step ; the strengthening of our power to resist temptation, or just a desire to turn from sin and make friends again with God. Whatever form it takes, it is a help given by God for some particular act, and a help that passes with the circumstances in which it is given.

So the Catholic Catechism says (qu. 286): "Actual grace is a supernatural help from God by which He enlightens our minds and moves our wills to do good and shun evil for the sake of eternal life . . . actual grace is not a quality dwelling in the soul, but a divine impulse from without. . . ."

Now it is impossible to lay down any general rules governing the giving of these graces. "The Spirit breatheth where he will" (John iii, 8). There are, indeed, times when we are conscious of receiving such a grace. A man, for example, assailed by a violent temptation, may be on the point of yielding when he casts his mind upwards, calls upon God for help, and is wonderfully strengthened to overcome the assault. But often, since he is so deeply immersed in other things and does not keep the ear of his soul attuned to God's voice, the divine call may be so faint that he is scarcely aware of it.

And if such be the case with one's self, it is manifestly impossible, in default of any divine revelation, to give even a guess as to how often such graces are given to men in general. All we know is that God is generous and does not stint his favours.

But if we know little or nothing of its frequency, we are not ignorant of its necessity. We know, for instance, that, unless a man be helped by grace, he cannot avoid, sooner or later, falling into grievous sin. And we are not speaking of sin against God's revealed law, which binds Christians, but of sin against the natural law, against the law that every normal man acknowledges as his standard of right and wrong. In other words, he cannot, for any long time, practise all the natural virtues. This, though never defined by the Church, is undoubtedly Catholic teaching. Without grace, a man may avoid some sins all his life, but he will commit others; for a time he may avoid all sins against the natural law, but sooner or later he will fall into some. How long he can go sinless we cannot say, so much depends upon his circumstances. Nor is this to deny his freedom. He is capable of overcoming every single temptation, but the time will surely come when human instability will lead to his fall.

From this first great truth flows another. If this holds

good of the natural law, it holds good still more rigidly of the revealed law, wherein commands are multiplied and duties enlarged. And so, as we are speaking of the free gift of grace, which we can never be sure of receiving, a third truth follows. Whenever we expel habitual grace from our souls by mortal sin, then as long as we remain in that state, we are in imminent danger of falling into other sins, of widening the breach between ourselves and God and making a return to Him more difficult. Therefore, realizing the awful evil of such a state, our prayer must ever be that God will enable us to overcome all temptations, so that we may never cease to be His friends and sons, members of Christ's mystical body and heirs of eternal life.

Eleventh Sunday after Pentecost

"Almighty God who . . . art wont to give beyond the . . . prayers of those who . . . pray to Thee." (Collect.)

Although it is possible and even normal for man to know God as Lord and Creator by using his natural powers of reason, there is a tendency for man to neglect and, in part, to forget his dependence upon God. This is not surprising. God works as a rule in a hidden way ; He does not interfere with man's activities ; while on the other hand, man's powers are so great and his achievements so wonderful, that we must not be surprised that God is forgotten. Hence it is that the Church has had, at various times, when man's independence of God has been particularly emphasized, to determine and define the many elements and different aspects of the true doctrine. We have already seen that a man cannot see God face to face in heaven unless he be made a new creature and be raised to a higher and supernatural state by the permanent gift of habitual grace. We have seen too that, if he be without habitual grace, it is impossible for him to keep the whole natural law for any great time unless he be helped by actual grace.

We have now to ask how this man, who is in a state of sin, without habitual grace, can turn round and come back to God, so that he again becomes His friend and the heir of heaven.

It is a practical question. Any one of us may, at any time, find himself in this position, for "he who thinketh himself to stand, let him take heed lest he fall" (1 Cor., x, 12) ; as possibly, even if not probably, all of us have, at one time or another, actually been in this position. But here, as always, a knowledge of the truth is not only a satisfaction to the mind, but also a safeguard and a help to the will. Ignorance, on the other hand, may well mean recklessness, with consequent danger and perhaps ruin.

Let it, then, be said at once that anyone who is in a state of sin, whose soul is empty of habitual grace, who is thus an enemy of God, can do nothing of himself to turn in his tracks in order to find his way back to God. He is as if he were dead. God is on one side of an impassable chasm and he is on the other. He may deplore his state but can do nothing to alter it. He may see the necessity of bridging the chasm, but by his own powers he cannot put even the first stone into position.

This may seem a hard teaching, contrary to God's mercy. It may even seem an unscriptural doctrine. There are in Holy Writ so many examples of Christ's listening to the prayers of sinners, so many passages where God tells us to turn to Him and promises to turn to us, where we are told to ask and it shall be given, knock and it shall be opened, that what we have said seems to be a direct contradiction of God's word. And if we want examples, there is, for instance, the Canaanite woman who had to use importunity in order to gain Christ's favour ; there is the Roman centurion who, of his own accord, as it seems, came forward to beg Christ's grace, and there are many others. Yet in spite of these examples and these texts, the Church, more than once, has solemnly defined the truth as I have stated it, namely, that of his own strength and his own powers, the sinner is absolutely unable to take the first step along the road that leads to God. He cannot move an inch along that road without the help of supernatural actual grace.

It is not a hard doctrine because with it there goes the teaching that God's mercy is infinite, that His love is overflowing, that He wills not the death of any sinner, but that he be converted and live, and that Christ died for all men.

It is not unscriptural because it results, not from a superficial reading of a dozen isolated tests or examples, but from a deep study of the whole of Scripture, which shows that, in all the cases mentioned and similar ones, the first call and motion come from God ; because it is only a particular application of the general principle laid down by Christ : "Without me you can do nothing"—and because upon this doctrine St. Paul, the Apostle of grace, continually insists, teaching us that our works are nothing, that our wills are powerless, but that "it is God who worketh in you, both to will and to accomplish" (Phil. ii, 13). And it is a very practical question. For this truth shows at once the tremendous importance of keeping in a state of grace and the extreme danger of falling into sin.

Whereas we know, on the one hand, that no sin is inevitable, but that every one can be avoided and that God will desert no man until He be deserted by him, we have, on the other hand, no certain guarantee that God will give still further grace to the sinner who has thrown away what he already had. No one has the right to presume on God's mercy, infinite though it be, or to think that he may throw away God's friendship now, and later on receive the grace necessary to start out on the road leading to divine sonship. The grace he has rejected may be the last to be offered to him. And if it be the last, his case is hopeless and he is lost. This truth, moreover, will serve greatly to nourish our humility. It throws us back into God's arms and makes us realize more fully our own nothingness, and put all our trust in God's mercy, who is thus seen to be in very truth our only strength and hope.

12th Sunday after Pentecost

"Our sufficiency is from God." (2 Cor., iii, 5. Epistle).

In order to combat those who, at different times, forgot man's absolute dependence upon God in all things appertaining to the life of his soul, the Church had to define the various aspects of this truth. But there is another side to the question, equally important, likewise denied, and also, therefore, the subject of the Church's definition. This is the question of merit. Though without God man can do no-

thing, with Him he can do everything. Though grace is an absolutely free gift, yet once man has it, he can so work with it as not only to gain heaven, but also to merit or earn or deserve it. Of His own love and mercy God gives him habitual grace, but in giving it to him He fetters Himself, if such a phrase can be applied to God, He binds Himself, so that eternal life is no longer something that could be given or withheld, but a matter of justice.

This may seem a bold saying ; but it is not only the truth but, given the reality of grace, given even the truth of the redemption, it is an inevitable truth. Moreover, it is a most consoling and encouraging truth.

By grace we get a new and higher nature, a partaking—to use St. Peter's words—of the divine nature. We become a new creature, adoptive sons of God, temples of the Holy Ghost, and we are led by the Spirit of Christ. In other words, we are as near being gods as it is possible for us to be ; God dwells in our souls in a special and new way. And if He dwells, so also He acts, for God's life is action. Consequently, the things that we now do, if they are good things and free acts, are not only our own, but are God's as well.

Or put it another way. By sanctifying grace we become branches of the vine which is Christ—"I am the vine, you are the branches"—and as in the natural vine the sap flows from the parent trunk through all the branches and, being active in all, causes them to bear fruit, so in the supernatural vine Christ's grace flows through all the human branches and, raising their natural activity to a higher level, causes them to do supernatural works. Or again, take the image of which St. Paul is so fond. By grace we become living members of that mystical, but real, most real, body, of which Christ is the head. So real is the union, so real is Christ's headship and energizing activity, that the Apostle can say, "I live, now not I but Christ liveth in me" ; and, if He lives, He acts, so that our deeds are no longer merely ours, but His also. They are ours and wholly ours, but they are also His and wholly His. Do not try to think of any natural analogy, such as two horses drawing a cart, or a man writing with a pen. In the first case each horse does only half the work, but a man's good deeds are wholly his and wholly Christ's. In the second case, the pen is only the writer's instrument,

with no free will and no responsibility of its own ; but a man is not God's helpless instrument, he acts of his own free will and is fully responsible for his actions, which are really his. There is no good natural analogy, for we are dealing with supernatural things.

But because the actions are Christ's they are really meritorious, really deserving of a supernatural reward, and because they are the man's own deeds, it is he to whom the reward is due. Hence St. Paul, nearing his death, can say : "I have fought a good fight. I have finished my course. I have kept the faith. As to the rest, there is laid up for me a crown of justice, which the Lord, the just judge, will render to me in that day ; and not only to me but to them also that love his coming" (2 Tim. iv, 7-8). A crown of justice to be given by a just judge, the prize of eternal happiness that we have earned and that God's justice cannot withhold from us.

We see, then, again, how exalted is the man in a state of grace. If he dies in that state, glory is his rightful wages. If he dies ; because he cannot merit, in the full sense of the term, that death should come when he is in that state, or, in more technical language, he cannot merit in justice the grace of final perseverance, although he can have full confidence that, if he does his part, God will give him this grace. He can, moreover, fully merit that he should increase and grow in grace and charity. This is Catholic doctrine. So that his whole life, or that part of it which consists of free good deeds, can be one long process of storing up an increase of grace and virtue in this world and of glory in the next.

For others, whether still in this life or passed into Purgatory, he cannot merit in the strict sense of the term, though, if we take the word in a wider sense, he can do so. That is, although his good works and prayers for others are no sort of claim upon God's justice we know that they make a sure appeal to His mercy and that they will not go unheeded. The whole Catholic teaching on merit inspires, therefore, a wonderful confidence ; it fills us with strength and comfort and patience in all our daily tasks, in all that we do for God whether we are working directly for our own sanctification or labouring for the spiritual benefit of others.

B. V. MILLER.

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

I. DOGMATIC THEOLOGY

HOW far, exactly, the human mind is able to go towards an understanding of the Christian mysteries is a matter upon which theologians might have been expected to be in perfect agreement, when one considers that the distinction between natural and supernatural truths of religion is basic in Catholic theology. And yet that all is not so clear in this question as it should be is proved by an interesting controversy which has been raging, and for all we know is raging still, among French philosophers and theologians. The trouble appears to have been started, at all events so far as modern times are concerned, by Père Rousselot's famous thesis in *L'Intellectualisme de S. Thomas*, to the effect that if the intellect has the power of knowing reality it is only in so far as it has the power of knowing God. According to this view the principles of St. Thomas force us to the conclusion that, far from the beatific vision being something which does violence to our intelligence, it is the radical possibility of the beatific vision, on the contrary, which defines the intellect formally as such: the intellect is the *potentia obedientialis* of seeing God face to face, and therefore it is the natural power of knowing reality. "L'intelligence est essentiellement le sens du réel, mais elle n'est le sens du réel que parce qu'elle est le sens du divin."

Apart from the advantage, theologically a more than doubtful one, of rendering unnecessary a strict demonstration of the existence of a God who is thus implicitly and formally affirmed in the very act of intellectual cognition, this view of the powers of the human mind makes it very difficult to defend the strictly supernatural character of the final end of man, the beatific vision; and it is from this standpoint that it forms the subject of a somewhat disturbing inquiry by Père Descoqs, S.J., in a small but important book, *Le Mystère de Notre Elévation Surnaturelle*.¹ Some of the theological implications of Rousselot's doctrine had been fully

¹ Beauchesne (1938), 135 pp. 12 francs.

developed, and admitted, by Père Guy de Broglie in a series of articles written thirteen years ago,¹ and more recently, in April of last year, the same writer published an article in the *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* of Louvain,² vindicating his position with special reference to the official declarations of the Church on the nature of mysteries. It is this recent article which Père Descoqs criticizes in his booklet. According to Père de Broglie the human mind is able to prove the intrinsic possibility of the beatific vision on grounds of natural reason. The dogma of the beatific vision is indeed a mystery, says Père de Broglie; it is obscure both as to its *an sit* and as to its *quid sit*. But the essence of the beatific vision is hidden from us only in the same sense in which all the divine perfections are hidden from us during this life, inasmuch as we have only an analogical knowledge of God. Consequently, although we cannot prove the fact of the beatific vision—since this depends upon God's free decree to grant it—we are able by the light of reason to prove its intrinsic possibility.

A study of the Brief *Gravissimas inter*, which condemned Frohschammer's philosophy, and of the text of the Vatican council on the subject of man's supernatural end, leads Père Descoqs to the following conclusion: The thesis which maintains that the human reason cannot furnish a purely rational proof of the metaphysical possibility of our elevation to the supernatural order (or, in other words, of the beatific vision) appears to be a necessary logical deduction from the documents of the supreme teaching authority of the Church. The essence of our elevation to the supernatural order, beginning with the possibility of it which is the foundation of that essence, is supposed in these documents absolutely to transcend the powers of the intellect, so that the human mind of itself cannot, either directly or indirectly, attain a rational certitude or provide a philosophical demonstration of it. Père Descoqs refrains, naturally, from stigmatizing the opposite view in any way. "Nous ne formulons," he writes, "... cette conclusion qu'à titre exclusivement personnel et privé et nous ne l'énonçons naturellement qu'avec cette

¹ *Recherches de Science Religieuse* (1924), pp. 193-246, 481-496, and (1925) pp. 5-53.

² *Du Caractère Mystérieux de Notre Élévation Supernaturelle*.

restriction : 'Salvo meliori judicio Ecclesiae.''' An interesting point, of which we shall doubtless hear more later.

The question of the final motive of the Incarnation, as debated between the Thomist and Scotist schools : "Would God have become incarnate even if man had never sinned ?" is familiar to theologians. Equally familiar are the *a priori* arguments used on either side, the one school arguing that its opinion better illustrates the greatness of the Word Incarnate, the other claiming that its view is more in keeping with the mercy and goodness of God. Well known, likewise, are the Scriptural texts quoted in favour of each opinion. What is less familiar is the appeal to the teaching of the Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries on the subject, and it is to a survey of this teaching that Dr. Spindeler devotes his interesting study *Cur Verbum Caro Factum*, recently published by Schöningh at Paderborn.¹ It is significant that when the Fathers want to prove against Arius and Apollinaris that Christ was not without a human soul, that he had a complete and perfect human nature, they seek their chief argument in the purpose of the Incarnation : Christ must have had a complete human nature, otherwise the whole of our human nature would not have been redeemed. When they want to show against Arius that the Word is God they argue that if the Word who assumed our human nature had not been truly God the purpose of the Incarnation would not have been achieved : the human race would not have been redeemed. When the Fathers distinguish between those texts of Scripture which refer to the divinity of Christ and those which refer to His humanity, it is always from the Redemption, the purpose of the Incarnation, that they argue to conclude that a particular text has reference to the Word Incarnate. Nor do these same Fathers, Dr. Spindeler points out, distinguish between a primary purpose of the Incarnation absolutely considered and a secondary purpose of an Incarnation *in carne passibili*—even in their exegesis of those Scriptural texts which are usually quoted as favouring the Scotist view. The same conclusion is drawn by the author from a detailed study of the controversies with Nestorianism and Pelagian-

¹ *Forschungen zur Christliche Literatur-und Dogmengeschichte*, XVIII, Band 2, Heft. 6M. 45.

ism : for the Fathers of the fourth and fifth century there is only one motive to be assigned for the Incarnation, namely, that which is expressed in the Nicene Creed : "Propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem descendit de coelis."

We have just received Dr. Bergmann's important doctorate thesis on our Lady's part in the work of Redemption according to the teaching of St. Albert the Great,¹ a work of which its author expresses the hope that it may throw some light upon a question widely discussed among theologians. As a critical study of the Mariological doctrine of St. Albert, Dr. Bergmann's work is undoubtedly important ; above all we recommend a careful study of his introduction, in which he enumerates and appraises the principles upon which the saintly Doctor's teaching is based. Eg. (1) "Quidquid tibi occurrit in ratione faciendum, scias fecisse Deum tamquam bonorum omnium conditorem" ; (2) "Ad omne inconveniens in Deo sequitur impossibile. Et ad omne conveniens, cui non major ratio repugnat, sequitur necessarium" ; (3) "Quidquid boni aliqua creatura pura fecerit vel receperit de hoc expers (Maria) esse non licet dubitari." In what extraordinary conclusions the indiscriminate application of such principles may result is known to those who have read some of our less sober-minded theologians on the subject of our Lady. As Dr. Bergmann truly remarks, they may be rightly or wrongly used, rightly or wrongly understood, and a theologian who makes use of them needs to have that theological instinct which will enable him to avoid exaggerated deductions. In particular with regard to the *Mariale*, upon which many writers rely almost completely for St. Albert's Mariological teaching, the author warns us that this is not only a monograph but also an early work, and that it suffers from the defects which may be expected in an immature and one-sided study. It is, moreover, primarily a book of devotion, and it would therefore be a mistake to quote expressions occurring in it as equal in value to the more measured statements of a set theological treatise. As to the part which Mary played in the Redemption, Dr. Bergmann rightly vindicates for St. Albert the glory of having shown more clearly than any other the close

¹ *Die Stellung der seligsten Jungfrau im Werke der Erlösung*; von Dr. Jakob Bergmann. Herder, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1936, 3 M. 50.

connection between her "Compassio" and her spiritual motherhood. The author does not himself like the expression Co-redemptrix, and he calls attention to the fact that St. Albert does not use it. Whether the Saint would have agreed with those theologians who say that Mary paid the price of Redemption with and under Christ, is not very clear from Dr. Bergmann's exposition; but we are inclined to suspect that he would not. "In ecclesia," St. Albert writes, "non est nisi caput et membra; capiti convenit redimere tantum, ergo membris redimi. Cum igitur Beata Virgo fuerit membrum, sic ipsi convenit redimi."¹ And, speaking of "justificatio generalis, quae respicit naturae debitum ex Adam", he says clearly, "quod solum solvere potuit Christus".² According to St. Albert it is true that all graces come to us through Mary. But Dr. Bergmann reminds us that when the Saint makes this statement he usually has in mind not Mary's heavenly intercession but the co-operation in redemption which is involved in her divine Motherhood. It was in this sense that his great disciple St. Thomas wrote: "By begetting Him who is full of every grace she conveyed grace in a manner to all." Nevertheless, the unity of the work of Redemption seems to require that Mary's intercession in heaven should be universal, and it is this consideration which prevails with Dr. Bergmann.

A second Mariological work calling for notice is Père M.-V. Bernadot's *Notre Dame dans ma Vie*.³ Primarily devotional in its purpose, the book is based upon a view of Mary's co-operation in our redemption which is daily becoming more and more popular among French and Belgian authors, and to that extent demands some attention from a theological standpoint. According to the view in question, Mary's merit availed, under Christ's, to reconcile the human race with God. "D'où viennent les sacrements et la vie qu'ils produisent dans les âmes? *De la source inépuisable que Jésus a fait jaillir avec Marie du Calvaire.* Les sacrements sont un signe de la Passion du Christ, ils nous apportent la grâce du Calvaire: et Marie a souffert pour mériter cette grâce."⁴ From this it seems to follow that the sacraments apply to our souls, not only the fruit of the condign merits of Christ, but

¹ See p. 81.

² *Éditions du Cerf*. Paris, 242 pp.
Vol. xv.

³ See p. 126.

⁴ P. 65; italics mine.

also that of the equitable merits of Mary. And, if Mary's merit is of this primordial efficacy, must we not also say the same of the Mass : that it applies to our souls the virtue of Mary's Compassion as well as that of the Passion of the Redeemer? These startling conclusions are not drawn explicitly by our author ; but I find a very similar statement made by Fr. Friethoff, O.P., who writes : "(Beata Virgo) simul cum Christo perfecit opus redemptionis nostrae, et ideo sicut Christus ita et illa est *causa universalis*, quam causalitatem universalem Christi *et beatæ Virginis* sacerdotes (Novi Testamenti), ut causae particulares, applicant singulis hominibus." ¹ In the light of such an explanation of the title Co-redemptrix it is hardly surprising that many theologians are averse to using it at all. With regard to the part that Mary plays in the distribution of grace Père Bernadot holds—what must now be regarded as common teaching among theologians—that all graces come to us through Our Lady's intercession. He adds, however, that "Notre Dame agit sur nous". Grace, he says, is a quality ; it is produced in the soul. And Mary receives from God the power to operate grace in us by the power of the Holy Spirit. In reality, says the author, this action by which Mary produces grace in us is not distinct from her intercession. In regard to God the prayer of Mary is a supplication which shows her dependence upon God and the union of her will with the divine will. In regard to us it is the sign of her maternal power and *the efficacious sign of grace*. "En intercedant pour nous, Notre Dame produit la grâce en nous. Sa prière est une action productrice de vie. Quand elle prie, elle forme des saints." We have already had occasion to refer in these pages to a similar explanation of Mary's instrumental causality in respect of grace. ² To put the matter quite plainly : Mary produces grace in us inasmuch as she intercedes for grace with a prayer which is infallibly answered. To some the matter would be plainer still if we said : Mary does *not* produce grace in us ; God produces it in us, in answer to the all-powerful intercession of Mary. If, however, even the sacraments are regarded as nothing more than moral causes of grace, then there will

¹ *De alma Socia Christi Redemptoris*, Rome, 1936, p. 149.

² See CLERGY REVIEW, vol. xiii, p. 260.

be no difficulty in attributing a similar, and therefore sacramental, causality to the intercession of our Lady.

More important from a purely theological point of view is Dr. Carl Feckes' *Das Mysterium der göttlichen Mutterschaft*,¹ which is a masterly dogmatic portrait of our Lady set against the background of the whole of Christian theology. The mystery of the Incarnation and that of Mary's divine Motherhood, inextricably bound up with each other in the decree of God's merciful Providence, appear here as the foundation of all that theology tells us about our Lady, and it is in the light of these fundamental truths of revelation that the reader is invited to study in turn Mary's virginal Motherhood, her bridal relation to the Word, her dowry of grace, her Immaculate Conception, and her share in the work of Redemption. In this last question Dr. Feckes confines himself to what is generally accepted by theologians, being especially scrupulous to avoid any exaggerations which might seem to detract from the unique role of the one divine Mediator, Jesus Christ.

G. D. SMITH.

II. HISTORY

There has been in the last few months, chiefly from the Continent, almost a spate of publications dealing with the general history of the Church, the majority attaining a remarkably high standard of excellence. Père A. M. Jacquin, O.P., is a Professor at the University of Fribourg in Switzerland, and the appearance of the second volume of his *Histoire de l'Eglise*² confirms the excellent impression which the first volume created now almost ten years ago. The volume has as a sub-title *Le Haut Moyen Age*, and the period covered extends from the Barbarian inroads in the fifth century to the death of Pippin the Short and the eve of the Carolingian revival. The book has all the marks of the best French scholarship—clear division, lucid exposition and a sound knowledge of the sources. Each chapter begins

¹ Schöningh, Paderborn, 1937, 177. pp.

² Demy 8vo. Pp. 683. Paris: Desclée, de Brouwer et Cie. The price has been raised since publication, and is not stated.

with a list of documents, and ends with a short bibliography of the latest literature on the subject. Père Jacquin refuses to be tied down to political divisions and periods. The Church for him has a life and activity of its own, and some of his best chapters are devoted to surveys of this life. Liturgical and monastic life, missionary activity, popular custom and superstitions receive generous treatment. There is, wisely, no attempt to overcrowd the picture, and the result is an extreme clarity and smoothness of narrative. One naturally turns to the chapters dealing with Anglo-Saxon and Celtic institutions and missions, and in a textbook intended for general use these could hardly have been bettered. The whole book has a remarkable vitality through the author's skilful interweaving of contemporary documents into the text of his narrative.

The sixth volume of Fliche and Martin's *Histoire de l'Eglise*¹ has been entrusted to the supremely competent pen of M. l'Abbé Emile Amann of the Catholic University of Strasbourg, a prolific contributor to the *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique* since 1914, and its editor since 1922. The volume begins with the pontificate of Pope Paul I (757-767), and closes with the dethronement of Charles the Fat in 887, the division and break-up of the Carolingian empire, the threat of the new Danish and Saracen inroads in Europe, and, for the West at least, the prospect of the imminent collapse of the Church in the midst of anarchy. This was perhaps the lowest depth that Europe ever reached. I hope to treat more fully M. Amann's account of the Eastern Empire and especially the schism of Photius, for he has been a pioneer in a new orientation of historical thought on the whole story of the Greek Schism, and his chapter on "L'Affaire Photius" is a summing-up of the earlier part of the question. The whole volume fully maintains the standard of its predecessors, though one may be allowed to single out for special mention the excellent account of the origin and purpose of the Forged Decretals, the monastic achievement of St. Benedict of Aniane, and the sober evaluation of Pope Nicholas I and his work. M. Amann writes with calm judgement which is not afraid to praise, nor, when necessary,

¹ *L'Epoque Carolingienne*. Demy 8vo. Paper covers. Pp. 512. Paris: Bloud et Gay. 75frs.

to blame ; nor is he afraid to note that political motives may at times lie behind papal action.

Appreciative references to the earlier fascicules of Dom Charles Poulet's *Histoire du Christianisme* have already appeared in these pages¹. Fascicules XVI and XVII² deal with religious thought in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the Renaissance (somewhat sketchily), the origin and progress of Luther, the evangelical movement in France, and the beginnings of Calvinism. These volumes, well printed and with some remarkably fine portraits, show the same clarity and assurance as were previously noticed. Again the author shows his preference for discussing the movement of ideas ; and it is interesting to note his opinion of Erasmus, "un révolutionnaire conservateur, la taupe de la Réforme, dont les travaux souterrains ont tout miné sans qu'il paraisse".

The Abbé R. Morçay's *Nouvelle Histoire de l'Eglise*³ is a small book intended for use in the upper forms of schools, and is one of the best short surveys of Church History I have seen. It reads with all the interest of a biography—the biography of the Church—and is alive with freshness and enthusiasm, besides conveying information, as on the Renaissance and origins of free-thought, not easily to be found in bigger volumes. Have we nobody in England to write a similar book for our schools? Mgr. J. H. Oechtering's *Short Catechism of Church History*⁴ develops a different idea in the form of question and answer. The fact that it is now in its twenty-eighth edition may indicate the wide use the book has had, and with a competent teacher it could form the backbone of an excellent course. Used alone it could be dull.

The last of these general histories is an American translation from the German, and seems to be intended for the average seminary student⁵. The sections dealing with Germany, both at the time of the Reformation and in

¹ See CLERGY REVIEW, VI, 159 ; VIII, 232 ; XII, 237 ; XIII, 182, 346.

² Large 4to. Paris : Gabriel Beauchesne et ses Fils. 25frs. each.

³ Large Crown 8vo. Pp. 350. Paris : Lanore, 48 rue d'Assas. 20frs.

⁴ Small Crown 8vo. Pp. 128. Herder Book Co. 2s.

⁵ *History of the Church*. By Dr. Joseph Lortz. Translated and adapted from the German by Edwin G. Kaiser, C.P.P. S., S.T.D. Demy 8vo. Pp. xvi+573. Bruce Publishing Co., London : Geo E. J. Goldwell, Ltd. 15s.

modern days, are quite the best and fullest in the book, but the whole work suffers, it seems to me, from two defects. It is thoroughly over-planned, divided and sub-divided, so that continuity of narrative is strangled; and there is a tendency to give too much comment with too little fact, resulting in cloudiness and vague generalization. There are no bibliographical indications, and the author's learning is not always up to date. Thus the importance given to Cluny in the Hildebrandine reform is much exaggerated. The true source of the movement is in the revival of the study of the Canon Law. Again, the problem of Honorius is not even mentioned. The book might, I think, be useful to a teacher, but would need supplementing in the hands of a student.

Dr. C. J. A. Oppermann's study of *The English Missionaries in Sweden and Finland*¹ is a thorough, scholarly but somewhat laborious account of what is to most of us an obscure corner of the Church's activity, the evangelization of the North in the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The greater part of the work was done by missionaries from England, men like St. Sigfrid, the Apostle of Sweden, Eskil, David, Woldred, Osmund and their followers. Dr. Oppermann, whose book is crammed with notes chiefly from Scandinavian sources, traces the main lines of each man's work and the later devotion that grew up round each name. The fullest and most interesting section deals with the activity of the Englishman Nicholas Breakspear and his companion Henry, who became Bishop of Uppsala, evangelized Finland, and was martyred in 1156. He was canonized by his former companion, now Pope Adrian IV. One senses in this book an attitude which would change the difference between "evangelization" and "Romanization" almost into an opposition.

It is somewhat late in the day to notice Mr. W. T. Walsh's *Philip II*,² but this is not entirely the fault of the present writer. Suffice to say here that, for English history almost as much as European, this is a book which all

¹ Demy 8vo. Pp. xxii+221. Published for the Church Historical Society by the S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

² Demy 8vo. Pp. xvi+770 with nine illustrations. Sheed & Ward. 18s.

students of the sixteenth century *must* read. Philip stands out from this fine, full, vigorous, colourful Catholic book, not the mythical Black Demon of the South, nor even the grim enigma of more modern historians, but as a consistent figure, a man grappling with a problem too big for him, failing at times to realize its significance, torn between his very real Catholicism and the new Caesarism summed up in the formula *le nouveau Messie est le roi*. He has long awaited a Catholic biographer who could appreciate this consistence, and Mr. Walsh has admirably fulfilled his task. Turning from Prescott and Motley it is interesting to trace the vindication of Philip in the successive biographies of Major Hume, Mr. David Loth and Mr. Walsh. The last-named has given us a fine exposition of what Mr. D. C. Somervell would call the "opposition view" of European history.

Mr. Francis Watson's biography of Wallenstein the famous leader of the Imperial forces in the earlier part of the Thirty Years' War is a well-written book based on wide reading, chiefly of German and Czech sources.¹ But the tangle of Imperial politics in the early years of the seventeenth century makes the subject one of difficult reading, and Mr. Watson has not quite overcome the obstacle. The son of a German father and a Czech mother, a wild youth in his student days, an adventurer, a splendid organizer, perhaps the first real war profiteer, the opponent of Mansfeld and the great Gustavus Adolphus, the friend of Tilly, and himself a Prince of the Empire, Wallenstein has always been a puzzle to the historian. Nominally a Catholic, in fact he placed more trust in the stars and in astrology, imagined the most grandiose schemes of Imperial unity and far-sighted commercial co-operation, was sacrificed to the fears of the Emperor and the Electors, recalled to defend the Empire, and eventually murdered by a band of hired assassins. His achievement was the marvellous organization of his own Duchy of Friedland, from which he arranged to draw all the material for his military activity, and so, in the profession of arms, became the richest man in the Empire. The true story

¹ *Wallenstein : Soldier under Saturn*. Demy 8vo. Pp. xii+439, with fifteen plates and an end-paper map. Chatto & Windus. 15s.

of his financial operations has still defied the historians. Mr. Watson's very able book has a few minor defects, and one which must damage its value in Catholic eyes. There is sometimes a straining of evidence in favour of his hero, and the lack of sympathy with the Counter-Reformation and the Jesuits makes the religious background very sketchy. That Wallenstein was tolerant of heresy is unquestioned. That he could use force to support the Counter-Reformation (from political or personal motives no doubt) is a side of his character for which Mr. Watson does not give us enough evidence. Yet the martyrdom of the Jesuit Father Matthew Burnat has been attributed to the hostility of the Hussites, enkindled not by the Jesuits' preaching, but by Wallenstein's more compelling methods of conversion.¹

When writing his *History of England*, Macaulay declared that he would not be satisfied until he had produced something "which shall for a few days supersede the last fashionable novel on the tables of young ladies". He was brilliantly successful, and his influence has been enormous. The method of writing may have been captivating, and the style consciously brilliant even to flashiness, but of Macaulay the historian critics have had unfavourable things to say, and in the main Sir Charles Firth² has upheld their more serious criticisms. Memory, not judgement, was Macaulay's strength. He made up his mind quickly, and he made it up for good. He was not open to new ideas or to revaluations, and inconvenient facts were ignored. "Macaulay had the mental habits of the politician, not those of the historian." Unflinching in assertion, absolute in judgement, he made no attempt to understand the mind of the past, but used it merely to glorify the present. These lectures, delivered at Oxford before the War, and now edited by

¹ Of the few minor slips, I note the lack of contact with things Catholic in the suggestion of Henry of Navarre's "saying a Mass to gain a throne". Mr. Watson is most suspicious of Jesuitry, and makes Jesuits of the Bohemian councillors Slawata and Martinitz, whom he aptly describes as themselves the first missiles of the Thirty Years' War. To call Father Lamormaini, Lamormain seems to be missing the point of his name. Wallenstein's motto *Invita Invidia* is mistranslated as *Welcome Envy*, and appreciations of Wallenstein's character are twice based on this mistranslation. There are a few unimportant misprints on the map and a bad slip in the middle of p. 272.

² *A Commentary on Macaulay's History of England*. Demy 8vo. Pp. xi+375. Macmillan & Co. 21s.

Mr. Godfrey Davies, are a valuable piece of historical criticism and make a most enthralling book to read.

Professor Powicke is one of the greatest of our modern historians, and it is inspiring to see the breadth of vision and high ideals he brings to his work.¹ To catch the spirit of the past, to breathe its air, to think its thoughts is perhaps an exacting ideal, but it should bring the student of medieval Christendom very close to Catholicism—perhaps too close to appreciate the permanence of the whole, or to see its implications for men of every age.

ANDREW BECK, A.A.

¹ *History, Freedom and Religion*. The University of Durham Riddell Memorial Lectures. Pp. 62. O.U.P. London: Humphrey Milford. 2s. 6d.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

DELECTATIO VENEREA.

(i) Is the teaching of moralists in this matter based on the assumption that the generative faculties are for the sole good of the species and in no way for the direct individual good?

(ii) Can physiologists be right in holding that the evolution and equilibrium, the personality and character of the individual depend on the presence of these faculties?

(iii) Is the opinion of Sanctius Cardenas and many others tenable, that not all voluntary acceptance of genitery pleasure is grave sin outside of matrimony? (S.)

REPLY.

(i) The teaching is based on the assumption that the *primary* not the *sole* purpose of these faculties is the good of the species. Cf. Canon 1013 §1.

(ii) As a general proposition the statement of physiologists is right. A castrated male, for example, lacks a faculty which belongs to him as a complete human being.

(iii) The question, in equivalent terms, is whether it can be safely taught that *delectatio venerea directe volita* admits of smallness of matter. The view of all the manualists nowadays is that there is no smallness of matter, e.g., Prümmer, "*Delectatio venere a directe volita extra legitimum matrimonium est peccatum mortale ex toto genere suo, ita ut non admittit parvitatem materiae.*"¹ P. A. Laarek-kers O.S.Cr.² is the only modern author, of whom we have any knowledge, to defend the opposite thesis, which was held by many theologians before 1612: "*Praecedente tali auctoritate non erubescimus thesim: Delectatio incompleta in genere luxuriae admissae vel etiam directe quaesitae, per se et in sua specie non est peccatum mortale.*" He defends this proposition with great skill and persuasion, but in our view, seeing the unanimity of modern theologians, it would in practice be rash to teach this doctrine. E. J. M.

¹ *Theol. Moralis*, II, § 682.

² *Quaedam Moralia*, Cuyk, Holland 1928, p. 54 seq.

COOPERATIO UXORIS IN ONANISMO.

Quaeritur utrum unquam permittatur uxori cooperari in peccato mariti contra bonum prolis? (M.Q.)

REPLY.

S. Poenit., 3 Aprilis 1916: Utrum mulier actioni mariti, qui ut voluptati indulgeat, crimen Onan aut Sodomitarum committere vult, illique sub mortis poena aut gravium molestiarum minatur, nisi obtemperet, cooperari licite possit? Resp. (a) Si maritus in usu coniugii committere velit crimen Onan, effundendo scilicet semen extra vas post inceptam copulam, idemque minetur uxori aut mortem aut graves molestias, nisi perversae eius voluntati sese accomodet, uxor ex probatorum theologorum sententia licite potest hoc in casu sic cum marito suo coire: quippe cum ipsa ex parte sua det operam rei et actioni licitae, peccatum autem mariti permittat ex gravi causa quae eam excusat: quoniam caritas, qua illud impedire tenetur, cum tanto incommodo non obligat.

(b) At si maritus committere cum ea velit Sodomitarum crimen, cum hic sodomiticus coitus actus sit contra naturam ex parte utriusque coniugis sic coeuntis, isque Doctorum omnium iudicio graviter malus; hinc nulla plane de causa, ne morti quidem vitandae, licite potest uxor hac in re impudico suo marito morem gerere. Miraturque vehementer *S. Poenitentiaria*, quod opposita sententia, cum humanae naturae dedecore, in quorundam sacerdotum animis (ut refertur) insidere potuerit.

S. Poenit., 3 Junii 1916. 1. Utrum mulier, casu quo vir ad onanismum exercendum uti velit instrumento, ad positivam resistentiam teneatur? 2. Si negative, utrum sufficiant ad resistentiam passivam ex parte mulieris cohonestandum rationes aequae graves ac pro onanismo naturali (sine instrumento), vel potius omnino necessariae sint rationes pergravissimae? 3. Utrum, ut tutiori tramite tota haec materia evolvatur et doceatur, vir talibus utens instrumentis,

oppressori vere debeat equiparari : cui proinde mulier eam resistantiam opponere debeat, quam virgo invasori. Resp. ad primum : *Affirmative*. Ad secundum : *Provisum in primo*. Ad tertium : *Affirmative*.

The substance of these replies, first given by Marc, is found in all the manuals, and it may be useful to have the complete text taken from Batzill, *Decisiones Sanctae Sedis De Usu et Abusu Matrimonii* n.xvi & xvii.¹ The distinction between the two types of action is evident. In the case of the husband employing instruments or other unnatural practices, the principle permitting co-operation for grave reasons cannot be applied, since the action is intrinsically and gravely wrong in itself, both on the part of the woman and of the man. Proceeding from the familiar to the unfamiliar, the *Sacred Penitentiary* directs that the woman's obligation of resistance is precisely the same as that of a virgin threatened with rape. Confessarius ne permittat uxores passive se habere . . . nisi talia verificarentur adiuncta rara, in quibus liceret virgini oppressae se passive habere, scil. ubi gravissima damna timentur et removetur periculum proximum consensus in pollutionem.² The matter is excellently summarized in n. 84 of the IVth Provincial Council of Malines³ : "Uxor vero quae contra voluntatem suam viro onanisticae praxi addicto cooperari adigitur, si maritus involucrum adhibeat, co-operationem utut materialem praestare non potest, quia huiusmodi actus in se pervertitur : ob timorem gravissimi mali, puta mortis vel alius equiparandi, ipsi licet non resistere oppressori. Quodsi maritus copulam exerceat cum retractu, uxor potest relate ad viri peccatum permissive se habere, gravem ob causam, secluso scandalo et etiam qualibet provocatione directa vel indirecta ad onanismum."

E. J. M.

¹ Marietti, 1937, p. 29.

² Génicot-Salsmans, *Theol. Moralis*, II, n. 550.

³ Dessain 1923, p. 54.

THE EUCHARISTIC FAST.

May we consider those sick people to be included in the privilege of Canon 858 §2 (*infirmi qui iam a mense decumbunt*) who are able to leave the house and hear Mass in church but who are unable, through sickness, to observe the fast? (D. M. R.)

REPLY.

When the decree of the *Congregation of the Council* first appeared in 1906, it was commonly maintained that the privilege could not be used in the above circumstances, but was to be restricted to the communion of the sick in their homes. Ferreres always held the opposite view, which gradually obtained favour amongst some authors. Vermeersch, Cappello, and others were cited in an answer given in this journal, 1932, Vol. III, p. 145, and our solution was that, pending any decision from the Holy See, the law of Canon 858 §2 could be interpreted so as to include those sick people who were able to walk to the church for Holy Communion, provided all the other conditions were verified. We find that there is no reason yet for modifying this view, which is held by the following writers, who have discussed the point since our reply of six years ago. Iorio, *Compendium Theol. Moralis*, Vol. II, n. 338: "Quodsi tales infirmi ad propinquam ecclesiam accedere valeant (vel etiam ad distantem curru aliove modo deferantur) non est ratio cur hac concessione frui non possint, dummodo aliae omnes conditiones in casu verificentur." Vermeersch-Creusen, *Epitome*, Vol. II, n. 124: "Attamen usus quidem invaluit benigne intelligendi vocem *decumbentes*. . . . Moraliter autem decumbunt etiam ii qui per aliquot horas e lecto surgunt, vel qui ipso morbo usu lecti prohibentur. Nec obstat quod in ecclesia vicina communicent." Cf. also Davis, *Moral Theology*, Vol. III, p. 216, and Capello reaffirming his interpretation in *Periodica*, 1935, Vol. XXIV, p. 29.

There are many, on the other hand, who hold that Canon 858 §2 does not apply in these cases, e.g. Noldin,

Vol. III *De Sacramentis*, n. 158 ; Prümmer, *Theol. Moralis*, III, n. 203 ; Merkelbach, *Summa Theol. Moralis*, III, n. 283. We think that the liberal opinion, as taught by Vermeersch Cappello and Iorio, may safely be followed.

E. J. M.

LEONINE PRAYERS.

Is it obligatory, or at least permissible, to add to the accustomed prayers the invocation "Saviour of the world. Save Russia" ? (X.)

REPLY.

The prayers were first introduced for the papal territories by Pius IX, in 1859, at the time of the spoliation of papal territory ; they consisted of Three *Hail Marys*, *Salve Regina*, and the first prayer. Leo XIII, January 6, 1884, made these prayers obligatory throughout the world, except after sung Masses, for the liberties of the Church. The second prayer was added, and the order was repeated in 1886. Pius X, June 17, 1904, permitted the triple invocation to the Sacred Heart. Since these prayers had in view the liberties of the Roman Church, many expected or desired that they would be allowed to cease once the Lateran Treaty came into force. But Pius XI, in a secret Consistory, June 30, 1930, made the following declaration in his allocution : "Christo igitur humani generis Redemptori instandum, ut afflictis Russiae filiis tranquillitatem fideique profidendae libertatem restitui sinat ; atque ut instare omnes, modico sane negotio atque incommodo, queant, volumus quas fel. rec. decessor Noster Leo XIII sacerdotes cum populo post sacrum expletum preces recitare jussit, eadem ad hanc ipsam mentem, scilicet pro Russia, dicantur ; idipsum Episcopi atque uterque clerus populares suos, vel sacro adstantes quoslibet, studiosissime moneant, in eorumdemque memoria, saepe numero revocent."¹ We, are, therefore, directed to recall the purpose of these prayers

¹ A.A.S., XXII, 1930, p. 301.

to the faithful assisting at Mass, but we are not ordered to recite any invocation such as *Save Russia*, etc. As explained in this review by A. B., Vol. III, 1932, p. 526, additional prayers may be added after Mass if they are customary, or if they are permitted by the Ordinary, a permission which may occasionally be presumed.

The invocation "Salvator mundi, salva Russiam" is indulgenced with three hundred days.¹ It may be that this indulgenced invocation is ordered in some dioceses, or it may have been introduced and become customary as a method of observing the papal direction: "adstantes quoslibet studiosissime moneant". We have no information on these points. If not ordered locally, or if it is not customary, we are of the opinion that it should not be introduced, since the indulgence contains no reference to reciting it after Mass, and there does not appear to be any general authorization permitting this to be done. E. J. M.

DISPENSATION CEASING.

Five years ago the parties in a proposed mixed marriage obtained a dispensation. They afterwards disagreed and the marriage was broken off. Now the breach is healed and they have married before a civil registrar. In order to revalidate this marriage is it necessary to obtain a fresh dispensation from the impediment of mixed religion?

(C. B.)

REPLY.

(i) The principle about the cessation of dispensations is contained in Canon 86: "Dispensatio quae tractum habet successivum, cessat iisdem modis quibus privilegium, nec non certa ac totali cessatione causae motivae." Canon 76 states: "Per non usum vel per usum contrarium privilegia aliis haud onerosa non cessant. . . ." These canons refer not to a dispensation given absolutely and for use once, but to a dispensation, for example, from fasting owing to ill

¹ S. Penit, November 24, 1924; *Preces et Pia Opera*, n, 293.

health, the use of which is recurrent. It ceases when the motive for its concession ceases, namely, when the person is no longer in ill health. It does not cease by not being used.

Therefore, a dispensation from a marriage impediment granted absolutely does not cease to exist even though it is not used and even though the motive for its concession is no longer present. The law on this matter has not been changed by the Code, and many of the earlier authors held that a marriage dispensation could be used even though another marriage intervened : it could be used after the death of the other party in the second marriage.¹ The post-code authors give a similar interpretation, e.g. Vermeersch-Creusen, *Epitome*, I, n. 205 ; Noldin, *De Principiis*, I, n. 188 ; Claeys-Bouaert, *Manuale Juris Canonici*, I, n. 236. Iorio, *Compendium*, I, n. 118, states : "Dispensatio quae non habet tractum successivum, semel concessa, nunquam cessat, quamvis cessat motiva ob quam concessa est, etiam ante usum dispensationis. Ratio est quia quod conceditur absolute, nequit ulla susbequenti conditione infirmari. Effectus praeterea talis dispensationis est indivisibilis. Sic dispensatus super impedimento matrimoniali vel irregularitate, non iterum afficietur eodem impedimento vel irregularitate, eo quod forte matrimonium vel ordinatio non habuerit locum."

(ii) But it must be observed that these authors all speak of a dispensation conceded absolutely, as most matrimonial impediments would commonly be. There is just this possible flaw, in applying the interpretation for impediments in general to a dispensation from *Mixed Religion*, namely, that the grant may conceivably be given with the condition that the parties do not marry *coram lege civili* before marrying *coram ecclesia*. Canon 1063 forbids them to appear before a non-Catholic minister either before or after the marriage *coram ecclesia*, and Ordinaries are directed, in their Quinquennial Faculties, to warn the parties of this law. Van Hove, citing a dispensation form issued by the Holy Office, notes that the word "dummodo" is used : "Dummodo neque ante, neque post matrimonium coram parochio catholico initum partes adeant ministrum acatholicum."²

¹ Ojetti, *Synopsis Rerum Moralium*, col. 1608 ; D'Annibale, *Summula Theologiae Moralis*, I, n. 235.

² *De Rescriptis*, p. 125.

From Canon 39 the effect of this word is to make the acceptance of the condition essential for the validity of the rescript. It is quite possible, though we can find no example, that an Ordinary might see fit to issue a dispensation with a "dummodo" clause relating to civil marriage before the canonical rite. The doubt raised can be solved only by examining the terms of the original rescript of five years ago. If it contains no invalidating condition concerning civil marriage, the interpretation given for impediments in (i) above will apply equally to a dispensation from the impediment of *mixed religion*.

E. J. M.

PANEGYRICS.

Recently a priest said a few words in the Church, at a funeral rite, in praise of the deceased person. Some thought that this was not allowed. Is there actually any prohibition of this practice ? (V.)

REPLY.

S. Cong. Consist., 28 June, 1917¹ issued a series of rules about preaching. Cap. iii, n. 21 states : "Elogia funebria nemini recitare fas est nisi praevis et explicito consensu Ordinarii, qui quidem, antequam consensum praebeat, potest etiam exigere ut sibi manuscriptum exhibeatur." The chapter and the preceding article are largely concerned with preventing political matters from entering into sacred discourses, but the prohibition applies to all panegyrics even though they have no political flavour. In the funeral rite, the Church does not stress the virtues of the deceased, or even apologize for his faults ; she deplores his sins and beseeches the mercy of God. The rule against panegyrics obviously applies only to the words of the priest at the sacred function in the church or cemetery. For exceptional reasons, in the case of a public man, it might assist the cause of religion to say something about the deceased's past life, but permission must be obtained from the local Ordinary.

E. J. M.

¹A.A.S. IX, 1917, p. 328.
Vol. xv.

ROMAN DOCUMENTS

Sacra Congregatio Concilii "Romana et Aliarum, Abstinētiaē et Ieiunii". (Acta Apostolicae Sedis, XXX, 1938, p. 160).

RESOLUTIO.—In plenariis autem comitiis, die 13 novembris, 1937 habitis, Eſſi Patres huius Sacrae Congregationis ad propositum dubium: "*An et quomodo expediat concedere dispensationem a lege abstinētiaē et ieiunii in pervigilio Nativitatis Domini*", responderunt: "*Negative seu non expedire, et ad mentem*". Mens autem est ut Ordinarii satagant opportunis instructionibus fideles inducere ad ius commune servandum."

Quam resolutionem in audientia diei 18 eiusdem mensis, referente subscripto S. Congregationis Concilii Secretario, Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Pius PP. XI approbare et confirmare dignatus est.

Owing to the difficulty of observing the law of fasting and abstinence, and also to the fact that Christmas festivities begin on Christmas Eve, certain Ordinaries petitioned for the law of Canon 1252 § 4 to be applied not only to Holy Saturday but also to Christmas Eve. The official commentary accompanying the refusal of this request observes that there is no solid reason for this concession, and any practice to the contrary is an abuse which should cease. Unlike the feast of Christmas, the Easter festivities actually begin about mid-day on the vigil. It is recommended that the ordinary rules of the moral theologians should be applied in individual cases, and likewise the law of Canon 1245 § 2 which permits Ordinaries to dispense "*ex causa peculiari magni populi concursus aut publicae valetudinis*". An earlier private reply of the *Code Commission* directed that Canon 1252 was obligatory everywhere, notwithstanding particular laws; but particular indulgences remain in force, for example, in some places the vigil of Christmas is a day of abstinence but not of fasting. Cf. Bouscaren *Canon Law Digest*, Vol. I, p. 587-590.

E. J. M.

CHURCH MANAGEMENT

THE FURNITURE OF THE HIGH ALTAR

3. *Tabernacles*

DIRECTIONS for the position of the Tabernacle and for its veiling are provided in Canon Law. If these directions are taken literally and put in practice, they result not only in great architectural beauty, but also in a theological significance which can hardly be unintentional. They indicate that the Church is expressing a definite symbolism, and is presenting it to the mind, through the eyes, in terms of form and colour.

The directions are brief and simple. Canon 1269 §1 prescribes the position of the Tabernacle in these words: *Sanctissima Eucharistia servari debet in tabernaculo inamovibili in media parte altaris posito*. The next paragraph of the same Canon continues: *Tabernaculum sit affabre exstructum, undequaque solide clausum, decenter ornatum ad normam legum liturgicarum*. The "norm" here referred to is defined in the *Rituale Romanum*, Tit. iv, cap 1, 6. *Hoc autem tabernaculum conopeo decenter opertum*.

When these simple directions have been carried out there is presented to the eyes an architectural feature of great significance and beauty. The front elevation of the high altar, clothed with an unbroken surface of colour, bears above it, in the "middle part" of the *mensa*, a tabernacle covered over completely with a *conopaeum* of the same colour. The two are in the closest relationship and form one object. It needs now only the addition of the third coloured unit, the chasuble of the celebrant, to complete that trinity of colour by which the Church proclaims her teaching that "the altar, when anointed with oil, provides a representation of Our Lord Jesus Christ, who is our Altar, Victim, and Priest". (Breviary, Nov. 9.)

Some writers have expressed an opinion that the primitive practice of reserving the Blessed Sacrament in a hanging pyx, suspended above the altar, displayed a symbolism of greater beauty, and one more worthy of the *latens deitas*; and that it was only the practical requirements of more frequent communion which necessitated the change to the fixed tabernacle, with the regrettable sacrifice of an arrange-

ment symbolically ideal. But I think it can be more reasonably claimed that the Church has been slowly evolving a more developed and complete symbolism; that the picture she now presents to us is the most beautiful of any in her whole history. During the celebration of Holy Mass these three spaces of colour dominate the whole interior of any church, and the eyes apprehend, almost unconsciously, the threefold representation of Our Lord, in his Altarhood as displayed by the frontal, in his Priesthood, as clothed in the chasuble, and as victim within the ample veil of the Tabernacle. And all three are grouped together to form one display of colour, the effect of which exceeds the sum of the three individual parts, especially when their colour is kept to one and the same shade of hue.

That the Church intends this symbolism to be observed, and not treated as a matter of unimportance or indifference, is shown by the answers to questions submitted to the Congregation of Sacred Rites. These answers, although available in such inexpensive handbooks as Fr. J. B. O'Connell's *Directions for Altar Societies and Architects* (1933), may be worth repeating in view of explicit contradictions of them published, even in the last year or two, in a book on church-building. It was there stated that the veiling of the tabernacle with the *conopaeum* was no longer obligatory, and priests have told me that exceptionally fine workmanship of the Tabernacle or of its doors excuses from the observance of the original direction. Both these exceptions are specifically denied by the S.C.R. in the following answers:

S.R.C. 4137 (1904). Question: Is it permitted to retain the custom of not employing the veil which should cover the tabernacle, where the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist is reserved? Answer: No, and the Roman Ritual and the decrees must be followed.

S.R.C. 3520 (1880). Question: If the Tabernacle of the Most Holy Sacrament is wrought in silver, gold, or other precious material, may it thereby be dispensed from the general obligation of being covered with the veil? Answer: The provision of the Roman Ritual must be retained. *Directions for Altar Societies* (p. 12) sums up by adding: Curtains hanging before the door of the tabernacle are no

substitute for the *conopaeum* and do not fulfil the law. In short, the *conopaeum*, derived from the Greek word for a mosquito-net, differs from the *velarium*, in that it completely envelops its contents from top to bottom and the whole way round, leaving nothing exposed.

GEOFFREY WEBB.

SACRISTIES

THE liturgical books and the manuals of ritual appear to take the sacristy for granted; the few references which they contain are concerned mainly with incidentals. Saint Charles Borromeo, in his famous *Instruction*, treats the subject at full length and with many details. The greater part of his directions still applies; the rest, however, is rendered obsolete by the peculiar conditions of our times. Many valuable and practical suggestions have been made by modern authorities on church building and furnishing amongst whom we may name Rev. Benedict Williamson, Rev. H. E. Collins, the authors of *Notes for Architects, Altar Societies, etc.*, and Mr. E. J. Weber. Saint Charles prescribes that the sacristy should be large and proportionate to the size of the church and to the number of clergy who are to use it. This would appear to be common sense: nevertheless, we must remember that a small church requires just as much room for storing the appurtenances of the liturgy and for the vesting of one or two priests as a very large church with a staff of several. Most of the sacristies in our older churches, as in many of the modern cheap ones, are much too small. There are some who would see in this a clinging to the English medieval tradition; for in the English pre-Reformation churches, if there was a sacristy at all, it was quite a diminutive apartment, and more often the space between the high altar and the eastern wall was made to serve the purpose. Our modern writers wisely suggest that there should be two sacristies, one for the clergy and one for the servers, and this system is rapidly coming into favour. American authorities advocate the placing of these two sacristies one on either side of the apse with a connecting passage. This system works very well in churches of the

basilican or Romanesque type, but cannot be happily adapted to churches in the Gothic style.

Saint Charles disapproves of doors which open on to the sanctuary ; he prefers that the door should give direct on to the public part of the church so that even for a low Mass the celebrant may proceed with a degree of processional solemnity. A door opening into the sanctuary is undeniably useful for the work of the sacristan, but surely the Saint's idea should commend itself to all who are liturgically minded. An old decree of the S.C.R. prescribes that if the door is directly behind the altar the clergy should approach from the Gospel side and retire from the Epistle side.

The sacristy should contain a lavabo, or lavatory, for the washing of hands, and also a sacrarium : the two must not be confused, and it is forbidden to pour into the latter water which should pass down the sink of the former. When a sacristy is in the building care should be taken to see that the pipe of the sacrarium leading to the ground should be a good wide one so as to prevent the common annoyance of stoppages.

There should also be a tap and sink in the servers' sacristy. All vestments, altar linen, holy vessels, liturgical books, registers of visiting priests, lists of foundation Masses, and other articles of sacred and confidential character should be decently preserved in the priests' sacristy. In many modern churches the wardrobe type of press has replaced the old-fashioned chest of drawers. A tall, upright press with sliding doors is very convenient and commodious : it can be made to hold all the vestments both for Mass and Benediction, and if it be recessed into the wall, so much the better. All the same, costly vestments which contain metal in the fabric can be more carefully stored in drawers, on the flat, than by suspending from hangers. Hanging tends to produce permanent and unsightly creases. All hung vestments, especially if they be of the ample design, should be tailor-pressed from time to time.

In the servers' sacristy arrangements should be made for the separate accommodation of cassocks and surplices : if servers are trained thus to hang each article on a different peg, the life of the article will be much prolonged. A sacristy lumbered up with an assortment of articles thrown

together anyhow is an unsightly display of religious disorder. Only such things—torches, thuribles, acolyte candles, for example—as are in constant use should be kept in the servers' sacristy, and these should be tidily arranged in stands, and not thrown anyhow against the walls. The processional cross should be kept in the sanctuary, or in a convenient side chapel. There should be a storeroom for all those things which are used only occasionally—tenebrae hearse, paschal candlestick, banner poles, processional lanterns, catafalque—and if the church is not equipped with a room of the kind the purpose can be well served by building a hut or shed conveniently near : here also should be stored all those necessary but unsightly objects—brooms, pails, and so forth—which are required for cleaning.

J. P. R.

BOOK REVIEWS

Life on the English Manor. A Study of Peasant Conditions, 1150-1400. By H. S. Bennett, M.A. (Demy 8vo. Pp. xviii + 364, with 10 illustrations. Cambridge University Press. 16s.)

THIS is a volume in the *Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought* under the general editorship of Dr. Coulton. It has already gone into a second edition, and has all the appearances of being a popular and useful compilation both for students of manorial conditions and for the general reader. There is no real discussion of legal problems, once such a topical question, and the book is rather a patchwork of pictures of manorial life than an attempt to trace growth and development. The progress of commutation is inadequately treated, and in general one has the impression that Mr. Bennett has in mind the "typical" manor or nucleated village. Yet modern authorities have wondered if a "typical" manor ever had concrete existence. There is surely some mistake (p. 256 and Index) in confusing Gavelkind and Borough English, two quite different forms of tenure.

The book opens and closes with chapters on the Church, and for readers of this journal these deserve some attention. They are frankly disappointing. There are a few slight errors of fact. It is not true (p. 9) that the priest turned round to face the people at the Elevation. The Sarum rubric is quite clear: "inclinat se sacerdos ad hostiam et postea elevet eam supra frontem ut possit a populo videri". Nor (p. 11) would slack members of the congregation leave the church as soon as the Consecration had been finished. Mr. Bennett means the Communion. But of more consequence is the spirit in which these chapters are conceived, and which makes them unreliable and misleading. Religion is discussed in terms of fear, superstition, and sham, all encouraged by the clergy. "At the same time the fear of reason was so great that wherever the Church could do so it stifled free inquiry." This from Cambridge in the twentieth century! Mr. Bennett seems to have no idea of the sacraments or their value, and odd notions of magic. He has obviously not read the *Summa Contra Gentiles*, which he

quotes from Dr. Coulton, completely distorting the argument. Unlike the rest of the book, these chapters seem to be based on second-hand evidence or on mere hearsay, and again and again Mr. Bennett's inferences go beyond the warrant of his evidence. Here is an example. He discusses (p. 36) magic and the way in which superstition was encouraged by the tales of wonders worked by the Host. "Hence, there was no witchcraft which the Host could not perform, and thus arose a body of tales." This is followed by a quotation from a modern writer whose conclusions, incidentally, must be accepted with caution. Then occurs this sentence: "What wonder if men went further for themselves, and regarded a Host as a charm and placed it among the beehives to prevent the death of the bees, or scattered it in fragments over the cabbages to keep off caterpillars." Mr. Bennett gives a reference to the *Dialogus Miraculorum* of Caesarius of Heisterbach, and the unwary reader will assume that this justifies his sweeping generalization. But, in fact, it does nothing of the kind. In the first place the German Cistercian is no authority on English conditions, and, in any case, the stories he retails are both given as exceptions, the one as a pious account of a striking miracle, and the other as an awful warning to those who might be tempted to such dreadful desecration. In both cases the guilty women confessed their sins, and Caesarius is able to point the moral from their punishments. "Attendant hanc poenam, etsi non culpam qui Deifica sacramenta ad temporalia, vel quod execrabilius est, ad maleficia convertunt." To generalize from these instances, as Mr. Bennett does, is an abuse of evidence. Yet the majority of his readers, undergraduates and students, will accept his statements without question, and the old stories against the Church will be perpetuated. It is a pity, for in other respects this book might have been valuable.

A. B.

His Holiness Pope Pius XI. By Monsignor R. Fontenelle.
Translated by M. E. Fowler. (Methuen. Pp. 278.
10s. 6d. net.)

MGR. FONTENELLE, who is a canon of St. Peter's, brings peculiar advantages to his task as biographer of the Holy

Father, with whom he has long been on terms of personal friendship : and yet his book is disappointing. Perhaps the author's very proximity to his subject has narrowed his vision, or it may be that his lips are sealed, preventing him from sharing with his readers the *arcana imperii* which conduce so greatly to the interest of biographical works. The fact remains that although this volume is without one dull page, it is not a good biography.

Having briefly set down the chief events in the early life of Achille Ratti, the author devotes succeeding chapters to describing the work done as Prefect of the Vatican and Ambrosian libraries, as Nuncio in Poland, and as Archbishop of Milan. The Conclave of 1922 is then spoken of, and the voting tabulated in an extremely interesting manner ; but having presented the new Pope to his readers, Mgr. Fontenelle takes him into the Vatican, whence he never emerges. It is the Pope's policy, not his person, that is the real subject of this memoir ; and that policy, in its many-sided activity, is described with an enthusiastic affection which clearly demonstrates that the author's work has been a labour of love. No pope has ever had a more devoted champion.

Twenty encyclicals have been given to the world during the Holy Father's Pontificate, two of which—*Casti Connubii* and *Quadragesimo Anno*—will rank with the greatest of their kind. It is in his analysis of these documents that the author displays his highest skill. He is less convincing, because less detailed, when he discusses the Pope's political actions. How we should love to know what his Holiness did say to Mussolini ! The various interviews between these two strong men, and other important personal encounters, will doubtless be described for a later age : and when these wonderful years of Pius XI, with "their agonies and their glorious triumphs" are at length depicted, the Pope's true greatness will be measured by the fact that his life and works are identical with the history of our time, and are not merely the subject for a biographical study.

This volume deserves very high recommendation for much that it contains. What the Pope has done regarding Catholic Action, his work for the Missions, his defence of Christian marriage and his fearless preaching of Social

Justice : these and similar matters, which should be of interest to all Catholics, are fully dealt with by the author. And if any proof be needed that Pius XI can inspire those about him with loving reverence and enthusiastic admiration for his great personal qualities, such proof is here most generously provided.

L. T. H.

An Introduction to the Study of Eastern Liturgies. By Père Sévérien Salaville, A.A. Adapted from the French with a Preface and some additional notes by the Very Rev. Mgr. John M. T. Barton, D.D. (Sands, 1938. Pp. 226. 8s. 6d. net.)

THIS volume is a translation of a contribution of P. Salaville to the *Bibliothèque Catholique des Sciences Religieuses* (Bloud et Gay, Paris, 1932). It is divided into two parts of which one treats of general notions (liturgical families or groups, languages, the legitimacy and, finally, the "high-lights and shadows" of the Eastern liturgies), whilst the other describes the principal elements of worship in these Eastern rites (church, furnishings, vestments, and books).

As the author explains in the introduction to the first part, for him the terms Liturgies and Rites are synonymous expressions. Since many might not agree with this rather arbitrary use of the word "Liturgy", it would perhaps have been better and more exact to use the term "rite" when we mean rites. Thus the term Liturgy may remain "commonly reserved to the Mass" as, says the author, is the case in the assemblage of Eastern Rites viewed as a whole (p. 7).

Everybody will be grateful to Mgr. Barton for his clear translation and for having added a few photographs. Together with the spacious printing these features constitute a definite progress in comparison with the original French publication.

The book is in general a little too schematic, and this makes it somewhat difficult for the reader to get hold of the matter. Perhaps it should be read together with the lucid, scientifically sure, yet simply written, *exposés* of the diverse Eastern Rites which have been and are being published in the *Eastern Churches Quarterly*, which is rather conspicuously absent from the bibliography. This is the more regrettable

since the authors of these articles are authorities in the matter, like Mr. H. W. Codrington (Syrian Liturgy, 1936, p. 10ff., 40ff., 87ff., 135ff.; the Maronite Liturgy, 1937, p. 37ff.; the Chaldean Liturgy, 1937, p. 79ff., 138ff., 202ff) and Dom Placid de Meester (Byzantine Liturgy, in course of publication). Another gap in the bibliography is the extremely important Vol. VI of the Woodbrooke Studies in which the late Mr. Mingana has published three treatises of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Lord's Prayer, on Baptism and on the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Since the "text and the sequence of events, as exhibited by Theodore, are to be considered identical in every detail with the very text and sequence of events that were current in the liturgical book of the Greek Church of the fourth century" this document has a first-rate value in any study of the Eastern Rites.

Finally, a query. Much has been said about the prayers of the Didache, some maintaining that they refer to the Eucharist, others that they are remnants of the agape. Could not the fact that the Sacramentary of Serapion (fourth century) has inserted it in its anaphora indicate that these prayers were already then traditionally conceived of as Eucharistic? And would it then be very rash to see in those prayers of the Didache at least a part of the oldest anaphora we have? Mr. Gibbins in the *Journal of Theological Studies* (1935, p. 373ff.) suggests that we can trace these prayers to the period between A.D. 30 and 70, and to Jerusalem as their original home.

DOM THEODORE WESSELING.

Higher Realms. Religious poems. By Paul Falvury. (Libri Catholici. 2s.)

In his Preface, Mr. Falvury writes: "it seems desirable that religious poems should stand in a category apart from general poetry". Such a theory must clearly be challenged, for it hovers on the frontiers of heresy. It is true that the great body of English religious verse has no more than a superficial appearance of poetry proper, and we imagine that it is this fact which has, to some degree, influenced Mr. Falvury's sweeping suggestion. But would he maintain that the religious poems of Dante, Langland, Francis

Thompson, Chesterton, Gerard Hopkins, Crashaw, Villon, Dryden and other great Catholic writers should be regarded, from the point of view of literary art, as divorced from "general poetry"? It may be, as Mr. Falvury also asserts, that "definite religious belief is not universal" (most debatable) and, therefore, presumably not a subject for general poetry. But truth is universal, and the Catholic Church its guardian and home; which is precisely why the greatest Christian poetry has invariably emanated from Catholic minds, poetry which has been no alien among the supreme non-religious poems of the world. Of Mr. Falvury's own verse there is not a great deal to be said. It is competent enough, but painfully pedestrian in its piety, seldom rising above a wasteland prodigally littered with the corpses of obvious adjectives and stale imagery. But somewhere in the distance there are hills, for we are startled by sudden echoes:

"I sought Him down the transient years of Spring
I sought Him down the Summer's fitful days."

Thus is "The Hound of Heaven" pursued.

Really, Mr. Falvury!

EGERTON CLARKE.

FROM FOREIGN REVIEWS

(1) *Die Liturgische Bewegung* (Instruction of the Bishop of Linz, Austria, *Linzer Diözesanblatt*, 1937, p. 114, reprinted in *Periodica*, 1938, p. 163). The Ordinary of Linz assails various excesses connected with the liturgical movement in that part of the world, e.g. celebrating Mass facing the people; removing the tabernacle from the altar to a recess in the wall; the laity communicating in a standing position; the faithful being forbidden to recite the Rosary during Mass. All these things, though done with a good intention, are against the law, either written or customary. Especially is it wrong to discourage the rosary during Mass, since its mysteries aptly commemorate the mysteries recalled in the *Unde et memores* of the Canon, and the devotion is expressly permitted by the Church during October. The bishop regrets that the liturgical movement is becoming,

with some people, a kind of "sport", with a tendency to separation from the body of the faithful ; he will not tolerate the liturgical enthusiasm of the few to impose itself on the whole community by force ; the junior clergy must not develop liturgical movements without the consent of the parish priests, who have the advantage of a long experience in the pastoral office. His strictures apply also to what is called *Betsingmesse*. Fr. Hertling, commenting on the document in *Periodica*, describes this as the recitation by a layman during Mass of texts from the Missal in the vernacular, but the episcopal directions would apply equally to what is called *Missa Dialogata*. The permission of the Ordinary is, in fact, required by the common law in order that all the congregation may answer Mass with the server, since the Holy See fears disturbance of the faithful if this practice is rashly introduced everywhere. E. J. M.

(2) *Litanies Majeures et Rogations* (Dr. E. Moeller in *Questions Liturgiques et Paroissiales*, 1938, n. 2). In accordance with the purpose of this journal, the author deals with his subject from the point of view of educating the piety of the faithful in the use of liturgical forms. The dates of these processions are those of similar pagan festivals, a good example of the assimilating force of Christianity in converting not only persons but institutions to the true worship of God. It is a mistake to regard these litanies as primarily an invocation of the saints. The latter part, consisting of invocations of a universal character, is the ancient and traditional form, to which were later added the lists of saints, so that we call the whole exercise nowadays *Litany of the Saints*, thus emphasizing what is really secondary. The importance of the general invocations should be stressed, in order to bring home afresh to the minds of the people that it is an official prayer for the whole Church of God and its needs, amongst which is included especially prayer for a good harvest. We should enter generously into this broad current of Catholic prayer, learning from it that the good of the whole Church is to be preferred to our individual needs. The saints are invoked more as members of this "praying" Church than for the purpose of giving each one the honour of a special individual cult. E. J. M.

(3) *De Patrimonio Paroeciali* (Dr. Bernier in *Jus Pontificium*, 1938, fasc. 1). The author continues his detailed study of what is called in one or two canons of the Code *patrimonium*, e.g. Canon 717 § 2, Canon 1522. Actually the word, as used in this discussion, covers such terms as *bona ecclesiastica* or *bona temporalia ecclesiae*. All these goods, revenues or monies, whether obtained in the form of offerings or of interest from an endowment, constitute property belonging to the parish as a moral person, or to the church if the building belongs to the parish. This parochial "patrimony" must be distinguished from the funds belonging to confraternities, or from funds constituting the benefice of the parish priest. It is this latter aspect which has considerable value for us in this country, and anyone who is interested in trying to discover what constitutes a benefice in England will find much useful material in Dr. Bernier's commentary. He is not directly concerned with *bona beneficalia*, but indirectly what he has to say has an important bearing upon the problem, since the various offerings which come under the control of the parish priest cannot all be considered *bona beneficalia*. They are, to a large extent, offerings given for the parish and the church, as well as for the support of the priest, and his control of all funds, except those which are belonging to his own benefice, is the control of an administrator. The points discussed have also an important reference to churches belonging to religious orders which serve as parish churches. The revenues of the church have to be kept distinct from revenues destined for parochial purposes. Canon 1182 § 2 is a good example of these necessary distinctions.

E. J. M.

CORRESPONDENCE

Father Gerald Vann, O.P., writes :

May I inform your readers who have interested themselves in the *Union of Prayer for Peace* that a small pamphlet is now available, explaining its purposes, the conditions of membership, the wishes of the Pope, etc., and that copies will be sent free on application (stamped, addressed envelope), though offerings towards the printing expenses will be very gratefully received.

It is hoped that eventually every country will have its own national centre and its own monthly Mass, and this has recently been achieved in the case of South Africa and the United States ; elsewhere the work must be done for the present as best it may from England, and it is here that the leaflet might be put to such good use in the ordinary course of correspondence within and between the various countries : it can easily be slipped into an ordinary letter envelope.

The Pope has put the cause of peace among the objects of this year's Eucharistic Congress ; it would be a great achievement if, working thus in harmony with the spirit of the Congress, we could bring the membership roll, now well over 10,000, to a quarter of a million before the end of the year.

Applications for copies of the pamphlet, stating number required, should be addressed to me, Laxton, Stamford.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

BOOKS RECEIVED

- THE FAITH IN PRACTICE. Catholic Doctrine and Life. By Fr. Philip Hughes. (London: Longmans. 286 pp. 5s.)
- A PHILOSOPHY OF WORK. By Etienne Borne and François Henry. Translated by Francis Jackson. (London: Sheed & Ward. 221 pp. 6s.)
- THE CHRISTIAN CHALLENGE TO CHRISTIANS. By Kenneth Ingram. (London: Allen & Unwin. 223 pp. 6s.)
- LES EVANGILES DU DIMANCHE. Expliqués et Commentés. Par Chanoine P. Magaud. (Paris: P. Tequi & Fils. 397 pp.)
- NOTRE-DAME DE TOUT NOM. Par Marguerite Perroy. (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer. 223 pp. 15 frs.)
- PHILOSOPHIA SCHOLASTICA. Vol. III—Ethica. By F. X. Calcagno, S.J., Doctor Phil. et Theol. (Neapoli: M. d'Auria. 367 pp. *Lib. It.* 14.)
- PRACTICAL MANUAL FOR MARRIAGE CASES. By William J. Doheny, C.S.C., J.U.D. (New York: Bruce Publishing Co. 304 pp.)
- COMMUNISM AND MAN. By F. J. Sheed. (London: Sheed & Ward. 247 pp. 5s.)
- HEART TO HEART. A Cardinal Newman Prayer-Book compiled from his writings by Daniel M. O'Connell, S.J. (New York: America Press. 322 pp. \$2.)
- LES AVENTURES DE DON BOSCO. Par Hugo Wast. (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer. 377 pp. 15 frs.)
- CONCERNING CHURCHYARDS. By Rev. A. Laurence Harriss. (London: Stockwell. 48 pp. 1s. 6d.)
- THE CRUSADE IN THE LATER MIDDLE AGES. By A. S. Atiya. (London: Methuen. 603 pp. 30s.)
- THE DEVELOPMENT OF RELIGIOUS TOLERATION IN ENGLAND (1640-1660). By W. K. Jordan, Ph.D. (London: Allen & Unwin. 560 pp. 21s.)
- THE BOOK OF JONA (Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures). By T. E. Bird, D.D., Ph.D. (London: Longmans. xxxvi, 18 pp. 2s. and 2s. 6d.)
- THE HISTORY OF ISRAEL. By H. Wheeler Robinson, D.D. (London: Duckworth. 262 pp. 5s.)
- SUMMA INTRODUCTIONIS IN NOVUM TESTAMENTUM. By Paulus Gaechter, S.J. (Innsbruck-Leipzig: Felizian Rauch. 276 pp. RM 6.20 and 7.20.)

BOOKS RECEIVED—*Continued.*

THE GOSPEL OF JESUS CHRIST. By Père M.-J. Lagrange, O.P. Translated by members of the English Dominican Province. (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne. 320 pp. 10s. 6d.)

RELIGION AND LIFE. By Rev. Aloysius Roche. (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne. 119 pp. 3s. 6d.)

A SICILIAN BORROMEO—Cardinal Joseph-Benedict Dusmet, O.S.B. By a Benedictine of Stanbrook Abbey. (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne. 250 pp. 7s. 6d.)

CHARISMES DE VIE SACERDOTALE. Par S. Em. le Cardinal Bertram, Archevêque de Breslau. Traduit de l'Allemand par l'abbé René Guillaume. (Mulhouse: Editions Salvator. 336 pp. 22 fr.)

LA PATRIE ET LA PAIX. Textes Pontificaux. Traduits et Commentés par Yves de la Briere, S.J. et P. M. Colbach, S.J. (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer. 453 pp. 25 frs.)

SYMBOLISM AND BELIEF. Gifford Lectures. By Edwyn Bevan. (London: Allen & Unwin. 391 pp. 15s.)

ENGLISH PRAYERS AND TREATISE ON THE HOLY EUCHARIST. By St. Thomas More. Edited with an introduction by Philip E. Hallett. (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne. 48 pp. 2s.)

THE UNITARIAN CONTRIBUTION TO SOCIAL PROGRESS IN ENGLAND. By Raymond V. Holt. (London: Allen & Unwin. 364 pp. 10s. 6d.)

AN AMERICAN WOMAN. The story of Elizabeth Ann Bayley Seton. By Leonard Feeney, S.J. (New York: America Press. 272 pp. \$2.)

HISTOIRE SECRÈTE DE LA REVOLUTION ESPAGNOLE. Par Leon de Poncins. (Paris: Beauchesne. 273 pp.)

OUR DEBT TO SPAIN. By E. Allison Peers. (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne. 146 pp. 5s.)

SPAIN'S ORDEAL. By Robert Sencourt. (London: Longmans. 336 pp. 10s. 6d.)

THOMAS BECKET. By Robert Speaight. (London: Longmans. 221 pp. 6s.)

LA PERCLUSE HÉROÏQUE. Par Paulin Renault. (Bruxelles: L'Edition Universelle S.A. 230 pp. 12 frs.)

HISTORY OF THE POPES. Vols. 27, 28 and 29. From the German of Ludwig, Freiherr von Pastor. Translated by Dom Ernest Graf, O.S.B. (London: Kegan Paul. 15s. a vol.)

IF YOU HAVE ANYTHING
TO SAY, WHY NOT SAY
IT PUBLICLY IN THE

Catholic Herald ?

The *Catholic Herald* Correspondence Page has become famous in two years because it has taken the lid off the minds of the ordinary hitherto silent Catholics.

Thousands read it and thousands (literally) write in it.

"UNDER TWENTY-FIVE"

To enable more and more Catholics to express themselves, this series of articles by young men and women of all classes and occupations has been started. A hundred manuscripts were received in the first month.

**CAN YOU AFFORD TO BE OUT OF
THIS ACTIVE CHRISTIAN FORUM?**

The Catholic Herald

From all Newsagents.

Every Friday.

Price 2d.

The Gospel of Jesus Christ

Volume I.

PÈRE M.-J. LAGRANGE, O.P.

In the recent death of Père Lagrange, the Catholic Church has lost one of the greatest scholars of his time. His monumental studies on the four Gospels make such large volumes that they have never been translated. But the present book, which will be published in two volumes in English, was written by him deliberately as a synopsis of his larger work for those who are untrained in scriptural controversy.

A strictly critical study, it combines the narratives of the four Gospels in an eminently readable form, explaining and commenting upon every incident. He does not attempt a direct life of Our Lord, as Archbishop Goodier has done in his magnificent volumes, nor does he provide the copious and elaborate footnotes which are invaluable for students in Père Lebreton's *Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ*. As a full commentary on the Gospels for the general reader, and especially for seminary students, Père Lagrange's book supplies a different need, combining immense erudition with a simple style and freedom from footnotes.

The translation has been admirably done by the English Dominican Fathers, and the late Father Luke Walker, O.P. was one of the principal collaborators in the earlier chapters.

Demy 8vo, 10s. 6d.

The Sunday Epistles Simply Explained

REV. E. C. MESSENGER, Ph.D.

Foreword by ARCHBISHOP GOODIER, S.J.

These short commentaries on the Epistles for every Sunday will be eminently useful to the clergy for preparing sermons; they also provide most interesting reading for the laity. In his foreword Archbishop Goodier writes that Dr. Messenger's "familiarity with the larger background has enabled him to say much in few words. He has kept in view the original situation which gave rise to the epistle; he has drawn from it the common lesson for all time; he has applied this to ourselves and the present generation . . . both a running commentary on the text of Scripture and an application to life which makes it the best kind of spiritual reading."

Crown 8vo, 6s.

BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE

Introduction to Ascetical and Mystical Theology

MOST REV. ARCHBISHOP GOODIER, S.J.

As the headquarters for theological studies of the English Jesuits, Heythrop College has rapidly gained recognition as one of the principal centres of ecclesiastical training in the whole English-speaking world. Archbishop Goodier's new volume adds a very important contribution to the growing list of original works which have already emanated from Heythrop.

As a spiritual writer, His Grace's reputation is almost unrivalled in all English-speaking countries, and many of his volumes have been translated and widely read in various European languages. Experts who have read the present work before publication declare that it contains the fullest reflection and summary of all his spiritual writing; and although this volume is intended chiefly as a textbook for use in seminaries its clarity of style and arrangement should appeal to the widest public.

It is based upon the lectures on Ascetical and Mystical Theology which Archbishop Goodier has delivered at Heythrop College over a period of five years, but these lectures have been revised and rewritten many times. They cover the whole field, in a volume divided into three parts, historical, doctrinal, and practical.

Demy 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Conferences to the Sisters of Charity

Volume I.

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL

Translated by JOSEPH LEONARD, C.M.

The Spiritual Conferences which St. Vincent de Paul addressed to the Daughters of Charity between 1634 and 1660 are a series of intimate conversations, rather than formal addresses, on the principles of the spiritual life as applied to their daily life. To those who think of St. Vincent chiefly as a man of action and a prodigious organizer in an age of great figures and immense activity, these conferences will reveal him in an unexpected light, as one of the greatest masters of Christian Spirituality; whether for those engaged in works of charity or in teaching or in the contemplative life. Father Leonard's translation will comprise four volumes, of which the second, third, and fourth are in course of preparation.

Demy 8vo, 10s. 6d.

BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE

The English Recusants

BRIAN MAGEE

Introduction by **HILAIRE BELLOC**

In this "study of the post-Reformation Catholic survival and of the operation of the Recusancy Laws" Mr. Magee has drawn upon a wealth of documentary evidence, hitherto neglected, and his investigations give results which must compel a revision of many accepted notions. A highly trained statistician, he has broken new ground in analysing the evidence to be gathered from Recusancy finance and from the ascertained participation of Catholics in public life. He is thus able to show at various periods the distribution of Catholics in each county of England and Wales.

His researches give remarkable confirmation to the contention that "a majority of the English people were opposed to the change in religion and that it was not until the end of the reign of Elizabeth that the balance began to incline against the Catholics". Thereafter, "the Catholic decline was a slow and gradual process. . . . For the most part the impression to be gained from contemporary letters, discussions, and debates is that the Catholics formed a very considerable minority of the nation. The more precise evidence of a statistical nature points conclusively in the same direction."

Mr. Belloc, in a long historical introduction, puts the whole question in its perspective, contending that "among the many problems which English history presents, far the most important is this: 'What was the progress of the Reformation in England?' [This] book . . . attacks the problem from an approach of the highest value; the numerical situation of the Catholics after they had become an opposition." *Demy 8vo, 10s. 6d.*

The Augustinians

E. A. FORAN, O.S.A.

No adequate history of the Augustinians, who are the oldest religious Order in the Catholic Church, has hitherto been available in English. Father Foran, who is well known for his detailed knowledge and painstaking research in the history of his Order, here tells the story from the early hermitages founded by St. Augustine himself to the election of Lanfranc as General of the United Order in 1256. He describes how the Order, having survived persecution by the Vandals and Moors, spread from Africa to Spain and thence throughout Europe. The book also includes the account of St. Augustine's life by St. Possidius, one of his earliest associates, which has not previously been published in English.

Demy 8vo, 7s. 6d.

BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE

the
lth
ive
A
the
ed
at
nd

"a
nd
ce
ne
on
he
re
ne

in
sh
ss
m
ne
d.

is
a.
r-
e
f
e
d
o
s



The Universe

*The most widely-read
Catholic paper*

THE CLERGY will find in "The Universe" the most comprehensive news of Catholic affairs throughout the world, supplied by authoritative representatives in practically every country.

THE CLERGY will find the official announcements of the dioceses of Great Britain faithfully and promptly recorded, and all news of nation-wide interest for the progress of the Catholic cause fully presented.

THE CLERGY will find representative and central Catholic opinion upon topics of the day voiced both editorially and by expert writers upon the subjects concerned.

THE CLERGY will find in "The Universe" the best medium of publicity for announcements, appeals and small advertisements.

*Its sale exceeds by many thousands the combined sale of all other
Catholic papers printed in Great Britain and Ireland.*

●
TWOPENCE WEEKLY
BY POST 12s. 6d. PER YEAR

●
184 STRAND, LONDON, W.C.2

BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE

Publishers to the Holy See

The PREMIER HOUSE for
CHURCH FURNITURE
WOODCARVING and
DEVOTIONAL REQUISITES

ROSARIES
STATUES
PICTURES
CARDS AND
CALENDARS—CRUCIFIXES
FONTS—FIRST COMMUNION
MEMORIALS — PRIE-DIEU
BIBLES, NEW
TESTAMENTS
PRAYER
BOOKS AND
GENERAL
CATHOLIC
LITERATURE

*Catalogues of Books, Church Furniture, and Devotional Articles
sent post free on request*

30-32 Manchester Street, Liverpool; 39 John Bright Street, Birmingham;
66-68 Bridge Street, Manchester; 248 Buchanan Street, Glasgow;
21-22 D'Olier Street, Dublin;
43-45 Newgate Street, E.C.1 **LONDON** 129 Victoria Street, S.W.1

